87-1259

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 26 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 87- .

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1987.

EDWARD J. KING,
PETITIONER,

v.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY, DAVID FARRELL AND PAUL SZEP,
RESPONDENTS.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

ROBERT H. GOLDMAN*,
DANIEL J. SUMPTION,
GOLDMAN & CURTIS,
144 Merrimack Street,
Lowell, Massachusetts 01852.
(617) 454-8804
Counsel for Petitioner

**Counsel of Record*

BATEMAN & SLADE, INC. BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

12 5PM

Questions Presented for Review.

On November 22, 1981, the Globe published an article written by the respondent Farrell. It refers, in about the middle of the article, to one David Thissen and included the following statement of and concerning the petitioner:

> The Governor has never run away from Thissen even in the face of strong recommendations by Hanley et al that he would be better off putting some distance between himself and Thissen. This personal loyalty King manifests towards associates never was more apparent than during the recent in-fighting over a satisfactory racing bill for the industry. Despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners.

I. Did the lower court err in holding on summary judgment that "The First Amendment protects as opinion discussion about the motives of public officials," where:

(a) The respondent Farrell, an employee of the respondent Globe Newspaper Company, specifically waived any First Amendment right to have the statement regarded as protected opinion, by admitting under oath that he intended said statement to constitute statements of fact;

(b) The court held that the said statement:

> "does not imply that the plaintiff acted pursuant to a corrupt scheme to obtain personal benefits in exchange for political favors. The article suggests that the plaintiff may have been too tightly bound by personal loyalties, but it makes no implication of corruption."

The statement however is capable of the reasonable inference of the existence of corruption between the petitioner and Keelan;

(c) Farrell admitted under oath he intended the words "close association" to mean "a business association."

On October 18, 1979, a cartoon, composed by the respondent Szep, was published in the Globe, alongside an editorial, expressly relying on and drawing from an article of the previous day. The cartoon depicts a billboard on which caricatures of the petitioner and one Locke, holding bags of money appear. At the base of the billboard is the name "Ackerley", and the billboard says, "Ackerley Billboards can put money in your pockets too!" The editorial suggests that the resurgence of the billboard industry was due to the fact that "industry money finally reached what must be the right places." The editorial asserts that persons associated with "Ackerley Communications, one of the nation's larges billboard firms . . . dropped $7000 into [the petitioner's] campaign treasury" and that, subsequently, the petitioner's administration took several actions favorable to the billboard industry.

II. Did the lower court err in holding on summary judgment that the cartoon and editorial constituted protected opinion under the First Amendment, where:

(a) On the respondents' motion for summary judgment, the cartoon and editorial were susceptible of being read by an average reader as either a factual statement or opinion;

(b) The average reader could have interpreted the cartoon as charging a serious crime;

(c) In determining that the cartoon and article could only constitute opinion, the lower court looked to a previous days' newspaper to reach that conclusion.

Table of Contents.

Questions presented for review	i
Table of contents	iii
Opinions below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Constitutional provisions involved	2
Statement of the case	3
A. David Farrell's November 22, 1981 article	3
B. October 18, 1979 billboard editorial and accompanying Paul Szep cartoon	6
Reasons for granting the writ	11
I. Farrell and the Globe specifically waived any right to First Amendment protection as to the Farrell article	11
II. The Szep cartoon and the Globe editorial	13
III. Certiorari on the principle of *Cox Broadcasting Corp.* v. *Cohn* is appropriate now	17
Conclusion	17
Appendices	follows page 17

Table of Authorities Cited.

CASES.

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 106 S.Ct. 2505 (1986)	14
Attorney General v. Bailey, 386 Mass. 367, 436 N.E. 2d 139 (1982)	14
Cianci v. New York Times Publishing Co., 639 F.2d 54 (2d Cir. 1980)	13, 16, 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED.

Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 (1975) 2, 17

King v. The Globe Newspaper Co., 400 Mass. 705, 512 N.E.2d 241 (1987) *passim*

Lyons v. New Mass Media, Inc., 390 Mass. 51, 453 N.E.2d 451 (1983) 12

STATUTORY PROVISIONS.

United States Constitution

Amendment I 2, 11, 12

Amendment IV 12

Amendment V 12

Amendment XI 12

Amendment XIV, § 1 2

28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) 2

Massachusetts General Laws

c. 128A, § 5 3

MISCELLANEOUS.

Liacos, Handbook of Massachusetts Evidence (5th ed. 1981) 12

Restatement (Second) of Torts § 563, comment d (1982) 14

Restatement (Appendix) of Torts § 566, comment c (1982) 11

No. 87- .

In the
Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1987.

EDWARD J. KING,
PETITIONER,

v.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY, DAVID FARRELL
AND PAUL SZEP,
RESPONDENTS.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

Petitioner, Edward J. King respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari be issued to review the decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court dated August 17, 1987.

Opinions Below.

The opinion of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts ("SJC") is reported at 400 Mass. 705, 512 N.E.2d 241 (1987) and is reproduced as Appendix A to this Petition at 1a-32a, *infra*. The Memorandum of Decision of the Superior Court is produced as Appendix B at 33a-94a.

Jurisdiction.

On August 17, 1987, the SJC reversed, in part, on another article, summary judgment granted petitioners by the trial court on April 30, 1986, but affirmed summary judgment on the article, and the editorial accompanied by a cartoon involved herein. Petitions to the SJC for rehearing after extensions of time granted by the SJC, were timely filed and were denied on October 28, 1987. See Appendices C and D at 95a and 102a, respectively. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) and *Cox Broadcasting Corp.* v. *Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 482-483 (1975). See p. 17, *infra*.

Respondents Globe and Farrell have sought certiorari as to another article involved in the case (*Globe Newspaper Co. and David Farrell* v. *Edward J. King*, October Term, 1987, No. 87-731).

Constitutional Provisions Involved.

This case involves portions of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution:

> Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press . . . .

U.S. Constitution, Amendment I

> No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . .

U.S. Constitution, Amendment XIV, § 1.

Statement of the Case.

A. *David Farrell's November 22, 1981 Article.*

On November 22, 1981, five days after petitioner, then governor of Massachusetts had signed a bill concerning racing legislation and four days *after* he signed an emergency declaration (See M.G.L. c. 128A, § 5 — legislative history), defendant Globe published in *The Boston Sunday Globe*, Farrell's article entitled "Missing VIP" (Appendix F at 26a). Farrell stated that he wrote the entire article on either November 17, 18 or 19, 1981, in approximately ninety minutes (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 324, 325).[1] Although the article did not purport to address anything else associated with the racing industry, Farrell inserted the following statements in the middle of that article:

> This personal loyalty King manifests towards associates never was more apparent than during the recent in-fighting over a satisfactory racing bill for the industry. Despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King had made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners.

Farrell *intended the phrases* "[d]espite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter, Eddie Keelan" and "King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation" *to constitute a statement of fact* (Farrell

---

[1] "J.A." refers to Joint Record Appendix of the parties in the S.J.C.

Deposition, J.A. I at 323-324). Farrell intended the words "close association" to refer to a "business association." (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 280-281.)

Farrell relied on his notes, Governor King's message to the Legislature and one Francis Rich as the basis for his November 22, 1981 column (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 253, 256, 282, 283; Exhibit 3, Tab 35). Farrell relied on the special message to the Legislature that petitioner filed concerning racing legislation to support his factual statement that "King has made no secret of his efforts" (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 281).

Only Francis Rich allegedly told Farrell that during the fall of 1981, plaintiff had allegedly met and talked to Keelan on Saturdays at the State House about the then pending racing legislation (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 282). Farrell relied on those alleged Saturday conversations as the *sole* basis for his statement that plaintiff was doing "Keelan's bidding" on the racing legislation (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 281-283).

Farrell knew that a person had to sign the Capitol Police Log to enter the State House on a Saturday and had doubts to whether Keelan ever actually was at the State House on Saturdays during that period (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 295).[2] If Farrell had examined said log, he would have learned of the non-existence of Keelan's name during the fall of 1981 (J.A., Exhibit 3, Tab 39). However, he did not (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 294-295). Instead, Farrell relied *solely* on Rich's "information" although Farrell knew of Rich's bias — Rich was plaintiff's political adversary in the upcoming gubernatorial election (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 253, 256, 282-283, 326-327).

Contrary to Farrell's *claim*, Rich neither told Farrell that petitioner was doing Eddie Keelan's bidding on legislation to benefit the Foxborough Race Track nor that Keelan had been

---

[2] A strict rule exists requiring visitors to sign the Capitol Police Log when entering the State House on a weekend (J.A., Exhibit 4, Tab 51).

to the State House to see petitioner with reference to racing legislation (Rich Deposition, J.A. II at 693; Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 294). Indeed, Rich never mentioned the word "legislation" nor spoke of the legislation in his conversation with Farrell (Rich Deposition, J.A. II at 695, 698). Moreover, Rich could not remember whether he learned of the information he gave Farrell *before or after* November 22, 1981 (Rich Deposition, J.A. II at 685).

Furthermore, in direct contradiction to his assertions in the November 22, 1981 article, Farrell's own notes clearly state that petitioner's proposals for racing legislation would be detrimental to the Foxborough Race Track and therefore *not beneficial to Keelan's interest* (J.A., Exhibit 3, Tab 35). Farrell relied on these notes in writing the article (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 252-253).[3] Farrell made all of said notes on or about November 10, 1981 (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 253-255, 310; Exhibit 3, Tab 35). Although Farrell had between three and five days to verify his "information," petitioner's uncontradicted anticipated evidence that Farrell will state that he never attempted any verification (J.A., Exhibit 1 at 230). Petitioner's anticipated evidence also alleged that Farrell will state that he knew that petitioner had signed the legislation without the amendments on November 18, 1981 (J.A., Exhibit 1 at 230). Although he could have made changes up to Friday, November 20, 1981 (Farrell Deposition, J.A. I at 299, 317), Farrell chose not to correct the article to accurately reflect the facts (J.A., Exhibit 1 at 230).

Keelan and petitioner denied that they ever privately discussed horse racing together (Keelan Deposition, J.A. II at 917; Exhibit 4, Tab 51). Keelan never discussed alone with petitioner the non-competition provisions of the 1981 racing

---

[3]Farrell's notes also reveal that Senator Olver was "upset with King and the game he is playing *with* Eddie Keelan" (J.A., Exhibit 3, Tab 35) (emphasis added).

legislation (Keelan Deposition, J.A. II at 926). Further, contrary to Farrell's allegations, Keelan was, at very closest, a distinct acquaintance and not a close friend or associate of petitioner at the time of the article (Keelan Deposition, J.A. II at 927).

Furthermore, Farrell wrote his November 22, 1981 statements concerning petitioner with definite bias against both petitioner and Keelan. As Crane testified, Farrell "doesn't write anything good about" petitioner (Crane Deposition, J.A. II at 540). Farrell's bias also appears motivated by money allegedly received indirectly from Keelan's competitor, George L. Carney.[4]

B. *October 18, 1979 Billboard Editorial and Accompanying Paul Szep Cartoon.*

On October 18, 1979, defendant Globe published on the editorial page of *The Boston Globe* a Michael Kenney editorial entitled "The Old Billboard Game" (Appendix A at 22a). On the same page appeared a Paul Szep cartoon bearing the caption "ACKERLEY BILLBOARDS CAN PUT MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS TOO!" (Appendix A at 21a.) Although the cartoon depicts a billboard containing petitioner and Barry Locke smiling while holding a bag of cash, Szep admitted that nothing in the cartoon indicates that the money came from individuals rather than a corporation (Szep Deposition, J.A. II at 704-706). Szep had no knowledge that petitioner personally received any money from Ackerley Billboards (Szep Deposition, J.A. II at 706).

---

[4] Petitioner submitted sworn testimony relating to the fact that Carney was a director of Merkert which paid Farrell money for "consulting", although no invoices for such consulting existed (Hughes Deposition, J.A. II at 662-669; Exhibit 1 at 75; Exhibit 3, Tab 33). Further, petitioner submitted evidence of Carney's response to a question: "Are you still paying Dave Farrell $500? I am paying him $1,000 now." (J.A., Exhibit 2, Tabs 9, 10.)

Szep wrote the cartoon without knowing the content of the pertinent editorial appearing on the same page (Szep Deposition, J.A. II at 702-703). Although Szep purportedly based his cartoon on a "news" article published in *The Boston Globe* on October 17, 1979, he could not definitively recall whether he actually read the entire article from the beginning headline right to the end of the article (Szep Deposition, J.A. II at 719-720, 722).

Moreover, Szep intended his cartoon to depict the existence of a *quid pro quo* between Ackerley and plaintiff (Szep Deposition, J.A. II at 724-725). Yet, the "news" article explicitly makes clear that the *only* favorable action relating to *legislation* concerned legislation *relating to a non-Ackerley sign* located at a ski resort in the Berkshires (J.A., Exhibit 2, Tab 7). Furthermore, Szep intended the cartoon to "indict" in the literal criminal sense Ackerley and therefore plaintiff for his alleged actions (Szep Deposition, J.A. II at 717, 720). Szep also stated: "*If you are doing your job properly you are being malicious every day*" (J.A., Exhibit 2, Tab 8).

Michael Kenney of the Globe wrote the editorial entitled "The Old Billboard Game" (Kenney Deposition, J.A. III at 1059). Kenney did not discuss the content of his editorial with Szep before or after publication (Kenney Deposition, J.A. III at 1059, 1061). "Industry money finally reached what must be the right places" referred to individuals allegedly associated with Ackerley who contributed to petitioner's campaign treasury fund (Kenney Deposition, J.A. III at 1091).

Moreover, contrary to the editorial, all of allegedly Ackerley-related contributions occurred after the September primary. See Bank Detail Report of Fund-Raising Contributors of the Committee to Elect Edward J. King (J.A., Exhibit 4, Tab 43). Of the seven contributions in question, four occurred on or after the November 7, 1978 general election (J.A., Exhibit 4, Tab 43). These contributions did not occur when petitioner was

"just as underdog candidate for governor." Further, the editorial incorrectly states that seven of Ackerley's "executives (and their friends and relatives)" made donations to petitioner's campaign for governor (see, e.g., McCracken Deposition, J.A. III and 1172-1173). The editorials also created the false inference that these legal personal contributions somehow occurred as a result of these individuals' purported association with the Ackerley organization. Brian McCarty, Vice President and General Manager of Ackerley Communications of Massachusetts testified that he had never heard, prior to reading the "news" article, that those seven people (allegedly connected either directly or remotely with Ackerley) had contributed to petitioner's campaign (McCarty Deposition, J.A. III at 1096, 1113). Indeed, Ackerley never reimbursed the "seven" individuals allegedly "connected" with Ackerley (McCarty Deposition, J.A. III at 1125-1126).

Moreover, petitioner testified that he did not know as to whether or not these people were in any way affiliated with Ackerley when his campaign committee accepted these contributions (J.A., Exhibit 4, Tab 50). Petitioner also did not know that persons allegedly affiliated either directly or remotely, with Ackerley had contributed to his campaign until defendant *Globe* published its "news" article on October 17, 1978 (J.A., Exhibit 4, Tab 50).

Immediately after, and inextricably linked to the reference of the alleged Ackerley-connected contributions, Kenney wrote:

> And back out of the Beacon Hill closet come all the old games. A bill zips through the Legislature and into law with King's signature to allow a ski resort billboard to remain despite a court order.

Kenney admitted that petitioner never signed the bill to allow a ski resort billboard to remain standing (Kenney Deposition, J.A. III at 1085; Exhibit 4, Tab 42). Kenney stated that a bill zipping through the Legislature signed by petitioner constituted one type of the old games that came out of the Beacon Hill closet (Kenney Deposition, J.A. III at 1086). In fact, the ski resort "billboard" legislation neither benefited the billboard industry nor Ackerley but rather the owner of a ski resort who privately owned the sign in question (King Deposition, J.A. IV at 1356-1358).

Editor of the editorial page, Ann Wyman, put the editorial page together for the October 18, 1979 *Globe* (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1011-1014). She did not remember seeing the editorial "The Old Billboard Game" before publication (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1004). Nor did she remember discussing the subject matter of that editorial with Kenney (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1003). Wyman assumed that she saw Szep's cartoon prior to publication (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1010).

However, Wyman did happen to remember reading an article appearing in the news section of the *Boston Globe* on a previous day which pertained to the subject matter of the cartoon and editorial (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1006, 1013). Although both Kenney and Szep purportedly relied on this article, Wyman stated that while *she probably had not read that entire article, she assumed that she read its headline* (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1007). Despite her lack of familiarity with the subject matter, Wyman approved the editorial (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1023).

Wyman "*presumed*" that she had also given thought as to the meaning of the words "on the occasion prior to publication." (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1035.) At the time she composed the page for publication, she had no knowledge whether petitioner received any bag of money from Ackerley Billboards

at any time (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1054). Wyman testified that *the cartoon and the editorial together tended to create the impression, without setting forth the facts, that a quid pro quo relationship existed between allegedly Ackerley affiliated contributions and petitioner's actions* (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1048).

Wyman admitted that the cartoon does not explain petitioner's alleged relationship with "Ackerley Billboards" and that the editorial did not make clear plaintiff's relationship with Ackerley (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1040, 1045). Wyman acknowledged that *even if* a reader looked at the cartoon and editorial together, read it as one, *it would be "not so clear"* as to this alleged relationship (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1041). Rather, for a reader to "understand" the underlying facts of said allegations of a *quid pro quo* relationship as expressed in the editorial and cartoon, Wyman "presumed" that the reader would have to look at other material that *had* appeared in an article appearing in the preceding day's newspaper (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1041-1042, 1048). Wyman conceded that every reader does not read the *Globe* every day and that some readers may read the *Globe* some days and miss it on others (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1043).

Yet, Wyman could not state that even if a reader found such an article, the reader would learn the basis for Szep's cartoon (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1048). Indeed, despite her lack of understanding, as to how and why petitioner benefited from Ackerley Communications, Wyman placed the cartoon and editorial on the same page (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 1045). Wyman chose not to avail herself of the opportunity to make corrections to the editorial to distinguish between Ackerley and non-Ackerley events and truth and fiction (Wyman Deposition, J.A. III at 991-993).

Reasons for Granting the Writ.

First, as to the *Farrell article,* this case presents the issue, apparently for the first time before this Court, of an important question of federal law which should be decided by this Court, i.e., in determining whether an article is fact or opinion in libel cases involving constitutional malice, the respondents Farrell and Globe could waive the First Amendment question of whether the article was opinion. Second, as to the *editorial and Szep cartoon,* this case presents the issue, apparently for the first time before this Court, of an important question of federal law which should be decided by this Court, i.e., whether in determining if an article is fact or opinion under the First Amendment in libel cases involving constitutional malice, the lower court erred in considering the effect of the article and cartoon on readers of the same in the light of a *previous* day's newspaper article of respondent Globe.

I. Farrell and the Globe Specifically Waived Any Right to First Amendment Protection As to the Farrell Article.

The lower court overlooked defendant Farrell's specific waiver of his First Amendment protection accorded statements of opinion. Libel defendants can waive the constitutional protection afforded purported statements of opinion by admitting a specific intent that the statement constitutes a statement of fact, because said protection is for the benefit of the libel defendant. See Restatement (Appendix) of Torts § 566, comment c (1982) ("The [d]etermination [as to fact or opinion] depends upon the context and circumstances surrounding the publication and indicating whether the term is *intended* literally or not and upon the precision or imprecision of the meaning

for the expression") (emphasis added). The First Amendment's protection against liability for statements arguably resembling an opinion, can be waived, similar to those protections afforded by other constitutional provisions such as the Fourth Amendment's protection against wrongful search and seizures, the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination, and the Eleventh Amendment's protection of States' sovereign immunity.

Mr. Farrell testified that when he wrote "despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King made no secret of his effort to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation," he intended these words to constitute *statement of fact* (J.A. I at 323-324). An admission as to a libel defendant's state of mind or intent when writing an allegedly defamatory statement constitutes a *binding* admission. See Liacos, Handbook of Massachusetts Evidence, 129-130 (5th ed. 1981). Farrell's admission that he intended that statement as fact constitutes a binding admission which clearly and effectively waives the applicability of the constitutional protection for "opinion."

So far as we have been able to ascertain there is no reported higher court decision to the contrary on this *waiver* issue.

Further, the lower court held that "[r]easonably interpreted, that statement may assert that the position the plaintiff took on that legislation was motivated by loyalty to Keelan, *and perhaps by self-interest,* rather than by concern for the public good." (App. A at 12a; 400 Mass. 705, 716 (1987) (emphasis added).) As the lower court in *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media, Inc.*, 390 Mass. 51, 59, 453 N.E.2d 451 (1983) stated:

> "Where, . . . however, the allegedly libelous remarks could have been understood by the average reader *in either sense* [— fact or opinion —], the issue *must* be left to the jury's determination."

(Citation omitted.) (Emphasis added.) The article, as the lower court correctly analyzed, could reasonably be interpreted to

state that petitioner enacted legislation on the basis of self-interest. Mr. Farrell's admission of his intent that the words "close associaton" refer to a "business association" with the petitioner taken with his statement that the legislation "would greatly benefit the harness track owned by Keelan *and his partners*" implies undisclosed defamatory false "facts" that plaintiff had an interest in the legislation he enacted, benefited financially from his actions, and therefore "acted pursuant to a corrupt scheme to obtain personal benefits in exchange for political favors." (App. A at 12a; 400 Mass. at 716.) They were facts charging a crime or corrupt plan, and not opinions that Farrell set forth, waiving any constitutional protection (J.A. I at 280-281, 323-324).

The lower court's opinion is in conflict with that of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in *Cianci* v. *New York Times Publishing Co.*, 639 F.2d 54 (2d Cir. 1980).

II. The Szep Cartoon and the Globe Editorial.

A. The lower court in determining whether the Szep cartoon and the Globe editorial were opinion or fact, adopted a unique and erroneous standard at variance with the decisions of this Court.

B. The lower court determined that the cartoon and editorial were opinion, not fact, in spite of the accusation of a crime or crimes allegedly committed by the petitioner.

The second issue involved Counts 7 and 8 and arose individually and collectively out of Paul Szep's October 18, 1979 cartoon and statement that "ACKERLEY BILLBOARDS CAN PUT MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS TOO!" and an editorial appearing on the same page entitled "The Old Billboard Game." The lower court erred in focusing not on whether

defendants carried their burden on summary judgment by proving that the same people who read the statement and article also read the report published the previous day, but rather on the fact that petitioner allegedly chose not to challenge the accuracy of the previous day's report.

Inferences to be drawn from the underlying facts contained in [materials submitted on summary judgment motions] must be viewed by the court in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. *Anderson* v. *Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 2513 (1986); *Attorney General* v. *Bailey,* 386 Mass. 367, 371, 436 N.E.2d 139 (1982). All doubts as to the existence of a genuine issue of material fact must be resolved against the proponent of the motion. *Id.* Defendants, *who bear the burden,* submitted no evidence that even a single person who read Mr. Szep's statement or the billboard editorial actually saw, never mind read, the article appearing in the previous day's paper. Moreover, no evidence exists on the record indicating that even one person in the general public *was aware* of the story in the previous day's paper. Defendants failed to show a commonality in the audience which read the previous day's paper and Mr. Szep's statement or the billboard editorial contained in the subsequent day's paper.

Restatement (Second) of Torts § 563, comment d (1982), recognized that members of the public do not read every article, report and column contained in every newspaper. The American Law Institute observed that "[t]he public frequently reads only the headlines of a newspaper or reads the article itself as hastily or imperfectly as not to realize its full significance." *Id.* Former *Globe* Editor Ann Wyman conceded that every reader does not read the *Globe* every day and that while *she probably had not read the entire article appearing in the previous paper,* she assumed that she read its headline (J.A. III at 1007). Szep could not state that he actually read the entire

article appearing in the previous day's paper (J.A. II at 719-720, 722). See Nolan, J., dissenting (App. A at 32a; 400 Mass. at 736). These statements indicate the *Globe's* awareness of the lack of commonality among its audience on any given two days.

Hypothetically, a 1987 reference to a defamatory "fact" contained in a report published in a 1970 edition of a newspaper would protect a statement from becoming an unprotected statement of opinion based on undisclosed defamatory facts, because no need for a commonality of audience exists. Thus, the lower court's holding that mere reference to a previous article appearing in an earlier newspaper constitutes a "disclosure" of underlying defamatory facts in effect creates a license to libel and adopts a unique and erroneous standard at variance with the decisions of this Court.

Moreover, the Court's repeated apparent reliance on petitioner's election not to challenge the "facts" set forth in the article contained in the previous paper, petitioner respectfully submits, is misplaced. Unlike the prior article, the editorial incorrectly asserts that a correlation existed between the alleged Ackerley monies and a bill relating to a ski resort "billboard" (actually a privately owned sign not related to Ackerley or the billboard industry in any way). (Compare J.A., Exhibit 2, Tabs 4, 7.) Szep's statement in its cartoon context states that the monies petitioner received were much more than mere contributions. The very fact that Mr. Szep depicted the secretary of transportation, who had no campaign fund, holding bags of cash buttresses this conclusion. The statement and depiction imply undisclosed false defamatory facts — "facts" not set forth or supported in the prior day's news article.

As recognized by Justice Nolan (App. A at 31a-32a; 400 Mass. at 735-736), a jury question exists as to whether Mr. Szep's statement is susceptible of being read by an *average*

reader as either a factual statement or opinion. An average reader *could have* interpreted the statement as meaning that petitioner accepted cash bribes in exchange for taking actions favorable to Ackerley Communications and to the billboard industry. The use of the word "pockets" together with the bags of cash in the hands of the governor and the secretary of transportation (who had no campaign fund to accept contributions) could lead the average reader to conclude that a bribe occurred. The word "Too" further indicates that Ackerley had already put money into the "pockets" of both plaintiff and the secretary of transportation. Since, as Justice Nolan observed (App. A. at 31a-32a; 400 Mass. at 735-736), the average reader could have interpreted Mr. Szep's statement as charging a serious crime, it is for the jury to determine whether the cartoon was in fact defamatory (App. A at 32a; 400 Mass. at 736) (Nolan, J., dissenting). The lower court's decision is at variance with that of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in *Cianci* v. *New York Times Publishing Co.*, 639 F.2d 54 (2d Cir. 1980):

> Almost any charge of crime, unless made by an observer and sometimes even by him, cf. *United States* v. *Panico*, 308 F.2d 125, 128-30 (2 Cir. 1962) (dissenting opinion), vacated, 375 U.S. 29, 84 S.Ct. 19, 11 L.Ed.2d 1 (1963), is by necessity a statement of opinion. It would be destructive of the law of libel if a writer could escape liability for accusations of crime simply by using, explicitly or implicitly, the words "I think".
>
> The principle of the *Greenbelt-Letter Carriers-Gertz* trilogy, of our own *Buckley* decision, and of the New York Court of Appeals decision in *Rinaldi* is (1) that a pejorative statement of opinion concerning a public figure generally is constitutionally protected, quite apart from *Sullivan*, no matter how vigorously expressed; (2) that this principle applies even when the

> statement includes a term which could refer to criminal conduct if the term could not reasonably be so understood in context; but (3) that the principle does not cover a charge which *could reasonably be understood as imputing specific criminal or other wrongful acts*.

(Emphasis supplied.) (Footnote omitted.)

III. Certiorari on the Principle of *Cox Broadcasting Corp.* v. *Cohn* Is Appropriate Now.

In *Cox Broadcasting Corp.* v. *Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 480-481 (1975), Mr. Justice White's second category of cases is where the Federal issue as determined by the highest State court will survive any possible outcome of future state court proceedings and require resolution by the Supreme Court.

Clearly, that is the situation herein, since this Court's rulings on the separate article involved *Globe Newspaper Co. and David Farrell* v. *Edward J. King*, October Term, 1987, No. 87-731, cannot affect the finality of the Federal issues as determined by the SJC herein.

Conclusion.

Petition prays that Certiorari issue.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT H. GOLDMAN*,
DANIEL J. SUMPTION,
GOLDMAN & CURTIS,
144 Merrimack Street,
Lowell, Massachusetts 01852.
(617) 454-8804
Counsel for Petitioner

**Counsel of Record*

Table of Contents
to Appendices

Appendix A — *King* v. *The Globe Newspaper Co.*, 400 Mass. 705 (1987) 1a

Appendix B — Superior Court Memorandum of Decision on Defendants' Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment (with attachments) 33a

Appendix C — Petition for Rehearing to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts dated September 14, 1987 95a

Appendix D — Order dated October 28, 1987, Denying the Petition for Rehearing 102a

EDWARD J. KING *vs.* THE GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY & others.[1]

No. 4296.

Suffolk. February 5, 1987. — August 17, 1987.

Present: WILKINS, LIACOS, ABRAMS, NOLAN, & O'CONNOR, JJ.

Practice, Civil, Summary judgment. *Libel and Slander.*

Discussion of the propriety of a judge's considering and allowing a motion for summary judgment after another judge in the same court had denied it. [707-708]

Discussion of the distinction in the law of defamation between statements of opinion and statements of fact. [708-710]

In a civil action by a former public official against an artist and a newspaper for libel in the publication on the editorial page of three allegedly defamatory cartoons, the judge correctly ruled, in granting the defendants' motions for summary judgment, that the cartoons were expressions of opinion protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. [710-713]

NOLAN, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part, was of opinion that summary judgment should not have been granted with respect to one of the three cartoons. [735-736]

A certain cartoon published on the editorial page of a newspaper was not actionable as libelous on the theory that it implied the existence of undisclosed defamatory facts, where the statement of opinion the cartoon conveyed was clearly based on uncontested facts published in the same newspaper the previous day. [713]

In a civil action by a former public official against a newspaper for libel in the publication of an allegedly defamatory editorial, the judge correctly granted the defendant's motion for summary judgment where the editorial, which simply posed questions and suggested answers about the way public business was being conducted, was a statement of opinion protected by the First Amendment. [713-714]

In a civil action by a former public official against a newspaper and a columnist for libel in the publication of an allegedly defamatory column on the "op-ed" page of the newspaper, the judge correctly granted the defendants' motions for summary judgment where a reasonable reader could only have understood the column as the writer's own satirical commentary on the plaintiff and his administration. [714-715]

[1] Robert L. Turner, David Farrell, and Paul Szep.

In a civil action by a former public official against a newspaper and a writer for libel in the publication of an allegedly defamatory article, the judge correctly concluded, in granting the defendants' motion for summary judgment, that, where the article suggested certain actions of the plaintiff were motivated by loyalty to an associate rather than concern for the public good, but made no implication of corruption, it was opinion protected by the First Amendment. [715-716]

The judge hearing motions for summary judgment in a libel case correctly ruled that a statement published in a newspaper article that the plaintiff, a former public official, "called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case" was unambiguously a statement of fact [716-717], but he erred in granting summary judgment for the defendants where there was a question for a jury to resolve whether those words were susceptible of defamatory meaning [717-719].

Discussion of "reckless disregard" for the truth constituting "actual malice" in the publication of a defamatory statement. [719-720]

Summary judgment in favor of a newspaper that had published a false statement of fact about a public official was not appropriate where the material before the motion judge would have warranted a jury in finding, on clear and convincing evidence, that the statement was published with the reckless disregard for its falsity thus sustaining the plaintiff's burden of proving the "actual malice" necessary for him to prevail. [720-722]

CIVIL ACTION commenced in the Superior Court Department on January 4, 1982.

The case was heard by *James P. Lynch, Jr.*, J., on a motion for summary judgment.

The Supreme Judicial Court granted a request for direct appellate review.

Robert H. Goldman (*Alan M. Cohen* with him) for the plaintiff.

Joseph L. Kociubes (*Robin A. Driskel & Don E. Gorton, III*, with him) for the defendants.

O'CONNOR, J. This is a libel action brought by former Governor of the Commonwealth Edward J. King against The Globe Newspaper Company, publisher of The Boston Globe and The Boston Sunday Globe (Globe), two Globe columnists, David Farrell and Robert L. Turner, and a Globe cartoonist, Paul Szep. The complaint is in twelve counts. In the first two counts, the plaintiff alleges that he was libeled by an article written by the defendant Farrell and published by the Globe on

November 8, 1981. Counts 3 and 4 make the same allegations with respect to an article written by Farrell and published by the Globe on November 22, 1981. Counts 5 and 6 assert that the plaintiff was libeled by a column authored by the defendant Turner and published by the Globe on January 10, 1980. Three cartoons created by the defendant Szep and an editorial accompanying one of them, appearing on various dates in the Globe, are the focus of Counts 7 through 12.

The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. The motion was denied by a judge in the Superior Court. More than two years later, however, another judge allowed the same motion as to all counts. The second judge ruled that the cartoons and the challenged statements in all but one of the articles were constitutionally protected expressions of opinion. He concluded that the statement in Farrell's article, published on November 8, 1981, alleged by the plaintiff to be libelous, was a statement of fact rather than opinion, but that it was neither defamatory nor malicious. To be actionable, a defamatory statement of fact about a public official must have been made with malice. *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 279-280 (1964). The plaintiff appealed, and we granted his application for direct appellate review. We affirm the judgment as to all counts except Counts 1 and 2, the counts based on Farrell's November 8, 1981, article. We reverse the judgment as to Counts 1 and 2, and we remand the case to the Superior Court for trial on those counts.

We begin our review with a brief discussion of the propriety of a judge's having considered, and then allowed, the defendants' motion for summary judgment after another judge in the same court had denied it. "Though there is no duty to reconsider a case, an issue, or a question of fact or law, once decided, the power to do so remains in the court until final judgment . . . ." *Peterson* v. *Hopson*, 306 Mass. 597, 601 (1940). "A judge should hesitate to undo his own work. . . . Still more should he hesitate to undo the work of another judge. . . . But until final judgment . . . there is no lack of power, and occasionally the power may properly be exercised." (Citations omitted.) *Id.* at 603. See *Dolan* v. *Von Zweck*, 19 Mass. App. Ct.

1032, 1034 (1985), and cases cited. Noting his reluctance to entertain a motion on which another judge had previously ruled, the judge nevertheless concluded that this case presented "many compelling reasons . . . to take a 'fresh look' at certain of the issues raised." One of those reasons, sufficient by itself, is that summary judgment procedures are especially favored in defamation cases. *Godbout* v. *Cousens*, 396 Mass. 254, 258 (1985). "Allowing a trial to take place in a meritless case 'would put an unjustified and serious damper on freedom of expression.'" *Appleby* v. *Daily Hampshire Gazette*, 395 Mass. 32, 37 (1985), quoting *National Ass'n of Gov't Employees, Inc.* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, 379 Mass. 220, 233 (1979), cert. denied, 446 U.S. 935 (1980). Even if a defendant in a libel case is ultimately successful at trial, the costs of litigation may induce an unnecessary and undesirable self-censorship. See *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan, supra* at 279. We agree with the judge that a second look at the motion for summary judgment was appropriate. This is particularly true in light of the considerable discovery that took place following the first judge's denial of the motion.

The judge allowed the defendants' motion for summary judgment with respect to Counts 3 through 12 on the ground that the cartoons and articles which those counts addressed were constitutionally protected expressions of opinion. In his thorough and scholarly memorandum of decision, the judge focused on the critical distinction in the law of defamation between statements of opinion and statements of fact. See *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.*, 386 Mass. 303, 308, cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1037 (1982). Statements of fact may expose their authors or publishers to liability for defamation, but statements of pure opinion cannot. Statements of pure opinion are constitutionally protected. *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 398 Mass. 731, 733 (1986). *Pritsker* v. *Brudnoy*, 389 Mass. 776, 778 (1983). "Under the First Amendment there is no such thing as a false idea. However pernicious an opinion may seem, we depend for its correction not on the conscience of judges and juries but on the competition of other ideas. But there is no constitutional value in false statements of fact."

(Footnote omitted.) *Gertz* v. *Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 339-340 (1974).

Of course, it is much easier to recognize the significance of the distinction between statements of opinion and statements of fact than it is to make the distinction in a particular case. "[I]t is hard to draw a bright line between 'fact' and 'opinion.'" *Janklow* v. *Newsweek, Inc.*, 788 F.2d 1300, 1302 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 107 S. Ct. 272 (1986). Nevertheless, sensible lines must be drawn. "The determination whether a statement is a factual assertion or an opinion is a question of law if the statement unambiguously constitutes either fact or opinion." *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, *supra* at 733, citing *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co.*, 380 Mass. 336, 339 (1980). However, the determination whether a statement is a factual assertion or is a statement of pure opinion is a question of fact if the statement reasonably can be understood both ways. See *Aldoupolis, supra; Myers, supra* at 339-340. Therefore, in an action of libel, the defendant is entitled to summary judgment if the challenged statement cannot reasonably be construed as a statement of fact.

Numerous cases decided by this court and others have identified factors that tend to show whether a particular statement is one of fact or of opinion. We shall discuss some of these factors in connection with our individual treatment of the cartoons and articles in issue in this case. We note at this point, however, that the purpose for which the distinction between fact and opinion is made is of paramount importance in making the distinction. Thus, the distinction between fact and opinion in a libel case involving a public figure, as here, must reflect "a profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust and wide open, and that it may well include vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks on government and public officials." *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan, supra* at 270. Of course, the distinction must also reflect our concern for the legitimate rights of individuals to reputations unsullied by defamatory remarks. We must strive for an appropriate balance between those competing values. *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers*,

Inc., 367 Mass. 849, 855 (1975). *Ollman* v. *Evans*, 750 F.2d 970, 974 (D.C. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 471 U.S. 1127 (1985). Thus, while in a criminal case the motive or intent of the defendant in performing an act is ordinarily treated as a question of fact, in a libel action a statement about a public official's motive or intent is ordinarily treated as a statement of opinion. *Janklow* v. *Newsweek, Inc., supra* at 1302, 1305.

We turn now to the specific cartoons and articles alleged to be libelous. On May 12, 1981, the Globe published a Szep cartoon, depicting the plaintiff attired in a striped suit, a black shirt, and a white necktie on which the words "Can Do" appear. The plaintiff is holding a hat with an attached pinwheel, and he is handcuffed to a police officer who is reading to another officer seated at a desk an apparent list of the plaintiff's appointees. The following words appear beneath the cartoon: "the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Guptill, the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Clifford, the appointment and forced resignation of Thomas DiSilva, the appointment and forced resignation of John Haggerty, the appointment and forced resignation of Barry Locke . . . ." A copy of this cartoon appears as Appendix A to this opinion. In determining whether a statement can reasonably be construed as a statement of fact, it is appropriate to consider "the medium by which the statement is disseminated." *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., supra* at 309, quoting *Information Control Corp.* v. *Genesis One Computer Corp.*, 611 F.2d 781, 784 (9th Cir. 1980). "Cartoons are seldom vehicles by which facts are reported; quite the contrary, they are deliberate departures from reality designed forcefully, and sometimes viciously, to express opinion." *Keller* v. *Miami Herald Publishing Co.*, 778 F.2d 711, 718 (11th Cir. 1985). Reasonable readers are well aware that "[c]artoonists employ hyperbole, exaggeration, and caricature to communicate their messages . . . ." *Id.* at 716. See also *Yorty* v. *Chandler*, 13 Cal. App. 3d 467, 471-472, 474 (1970).

The plaintiff contends that the "appointments" cartoon makes a statement that he appointed individuals to government positions whom he knew at the time of appointment to have engaged

in unethical or criminal conduct, and that the plaintiff had a criminally culpable state of mind. However, we agree with the judge that the cartoon unambiguously is a statement of the cartoonist's opinion, expressed by the use of "artistic rhetorical hyperbole," that the plaintiff was responsible for several ill-advised appointments. As the judge observed, it would be unreasonable to interpret that cartoon as a disclosure that "the plaintiff had been arrested, handcuffed, and charged, or was a criminal, or knew of criminal or unethical conduct of his appointees before their selection."

Another Szep cartoon, published November 9, 1979, is entitled "King Signs School Prayer Bill," and depicts the plaintiff at a desk signing a piece of paper, presumably the school prayer bill. He is flanked on one side by a person named "Patronage" and on the other side by a person named "Cronyism." "Patronage" carries in his pocket a satchel labeled "Pay Raise," and "Cronyism" holds the plaintiff's arm as the plaintiff signs the paper. Packets of money are on the desk in front of "Cronyism." The caption to the cartoon is "So Let Us Prey!" A copy of the cartoon appears at the end of this opinion as Appendix B.

As we observed in connection with the "appointments" cartoon, cartoons are seldom designed to disclose facts, but rather are ordinarily understood by reasonable viewers to be rhetorical, exaggerated means of expressing opinions. The plaintiff argues in reference to the "School Prayer Bill" cartoon that "an inference exists that the packets of money on the table that 'Cronyism' is holding relate not to the Pay Raise Bill but to monetary payments Plaintiff allegedly received or was to receive for signing the School Prayer Bill. The linked arms of 'Cronyism' and Plaintiff can only indicate a direct or indirect correlation between the money on the table and Plaintiff's signing of the School Prayer Bill. The 'So Let Us Prey!' caption clearly implies that Plaintiff was preying on the public by enacting legislation in exchange for monetary compensation." We are not persuaded by the plaintiff's argument. In our view, the interpretation of the cartoon advanced by the plaintiff is unreasonably strained. Statements alleged to be libelous must

be interpreted reasonably. *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media, Inc.*, 390 Mass. 51, 60 (1983). The cartoon in question cannot reasonably be construed as representing as a fact that the plaintiff had been guilty of extortion or had accepted a bribe to sign the school prayer bill. At the most, the cartoon may suggest that the plaintiff was motivated to sign the school prayer bill by his interest in attracting legislative support for the pay raise bill, which, in the cartoonist's view, constituted preying on the public. But, the First Amendment protects the questioning and impugning of the motives of public officials. See *Janklow* v. *Newsweek, Inc.*, *supra* at 1305 ("It is vital to our form of government that press and citizens alike be free to discuss and, if they see fit, impugn the motives of public officials").

The final cartoon of which the plaintiff complains was a Szep cartoon published by the Globe on October 18, 1979. On the previous day, the Globe had published an article prepared by its Spotlight Team of investigative reporters detailing efforts by Secretary of Transportation Barry Locke to protect and preserve certain billboards slated for removal. The article, not challenged here, also reported that industry officials, friends, and relatives had contributed to the plaintiff's 1978 gubernatorial election campaign. On October 18, the Szep cartoon was published alongside an editorial. The editorial expressly relied on and drew from the article of the previous day. The cartoon depicts a billboard on which caricatures of the plaintiff and Locke, holding bags of money, appear. At the base of the billboard is the name "Ackerley," and the billboard says, "Ackerley Billboards can put money in your pockets too!" Copies of this cartoon and the accompanying editorial appear as Appendices C and D to this opinion. The editorial suggests that the resurgence of the billboard industry was due to the fact that "industry money finally reached what must be the right places." The editorial asserts that persons associated with "Ackerley Communications, one of the nation's largest billboard firms . . . dropped $7000 into [the plaintiff's] campaign treasury" and that, subsequently, the plaintiff's administration took several actions favorable to the billboard industry.

The billboard cartoon must be viewed as a protected expression of opinion. We do not agree with the plaintiff that the cartoon depicts him "accepting cash bribes . . . in return for his support of the efforts of Ackerley Communications." Rather, we agree with the judge that "[t]he alleged facts figuratively conveyed by the cartoon (that the plaintiff and Locke received personal cash contributions and/or payoffs from Ackerley) simply do not flow from a form of expression that clearly draws upon overstatement and extravagant symbolism to make its point. The cartoon implies nothing more than Szep's editorial judgment that the plaintiff's association with Ackerley raised questions of public concern."

A statement cast in the form of an opinion may imply the existence of undisclosed defamatory facts on which the opinion purports to be based, and thus may be actionable. See *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, *supra* at 735; *Fleming* v. *Benzaquin*, 390 Mass. 175, 187 (1983); *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.*, *supra* at 312-313; *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co.*, *supra* at 338-339; *National Ass'n of Gov't Employees, Inc.* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, *supra* at 227-228; Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 (1977). But, the billboard cartoon does not imply the existence of undisclosed facts. On the contrary, the cartoon was clearly based on the facts disclosed in the report that had been published the previous day, which are not contested here.

The statements contained in the editorial accompanying the billboard cartoon also fall within the ambit of protected opinion. The primary theme of the editorial is a condemnation of the billboard industry's actions, objectives, and lobbying practices. The plaintiff focuses especially on the statement appearing in the editorial's fourth paragraph that says that "apparently . . . industry money finally reached what must be the right places." The plaintiff contends that the editorial accuses him of corruptly furthering the industry's interests in exchange for campaign contributions. The word "apparently" makes clear that the author of the statement is indulging in speculation, or at most, deduction. Moreover, the editorial spells out the reasons why that deduction was made: (1) money associated with the

billboard industry was contributed to the plaintiff's gubernatorial campaign, and (2) public opinion and the public interest were opposed to favorable treatment for the industry, so some other reason for its resurgence must be supposed. The editorial simply posed questions and suggested answers, as a matter of opinion, about the way public business was being conducted. The First Amendment protects such discussion.

On January 10, 1980, the Globe published on its op-ed page a column authored by the defendant Robert L. Turner. A copy of the column appears as Appendix E following this opinion. The entire column, labeled "Political Circuit By Robert L. Turner," consists of a fictitious press release purporting to have been issued by the plaintiff. It introduces the release with the words, "Following is a statement from Gov. Edward J. King on the departure of his press secretary, Ronald C. Brinn." Construed literally, the "Press Release" column falsely attributes to the plaintiff various statements which may have discredited him. Such false attribution can be defamatory. See *Schrottman* v. *Barnicle*, 386 Mass. 627, 641 (1982). However, just as we held in *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co.*, 380 Mass. 336 (1980), that, read in context, the statement that a sportscaster "is enrolled in a course for remedial speaking" could not reasonably be interpreted in a literal sense, so too, a literal construction of the "press release" as originating with the plaintiff would have been unreasonable. A reasonable reader could only have understood the column as Turner's own commentary on the plaintiff and his administration.

Reasonable readers "expect to read columnists' views and opinions as opposed to factual news stories" on an op-ed page. *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 398 Mass. 731, 734 (1986). Furthermore, the entire column, appearing under Turner's name, consisted of the fictitious press release. Clearly, Turner was employing the plaintiff's "voice" as a device to convey his own ideas. It might have been different if the column presented the press release and then proceeded to analyze and comment on it. Also, as in *Myers*, *supra* at 342, the "press release" contains numerous obvious attempts at humor, which one would not expect to find in an authentic

press release. The release purports to concern the departure of the plaintiff's press secretary. It begins with the words, "Good riddance," and proceeds to blame on the press secretary mishaps and misunderstandings that Turner obviously believed to be flaws in the plaintiff's performance. The press secretary is referred to as "the hard-boiled grinch who told me to cut off funds to the Pine Street Inn a week before Christmas." The release also declares in obvious tongue-in-cheek fashion that, if the press secretary was poorly informed about the plaintiff's administration, it was not the plaintiff's fault because the plaintiff "told him to read the papers. Somebody in this administration ought to read the papers." The column concludes with the italicized proposal, "For a recorded actuality of Gov. Edward J. King reading this press release, call 'Dial-a-Governor' — 1-800-632-8222." We are satisfied that a reasonable reader would have recognized Turner's column as satire. Contrary to the plaintiff's contention, no cautionary words to that effect were necessary. See, regarding the use of cautionary words, *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, *supra*.

On November 22, 1981, the Globe published an article written by the defendant Farrell. The article is reproduced in Appendix F. The article focuses primarily on one David Thissen and his relationship with various public figures, and it discusses the fact that the plaintiff remained loyal to the controversial Thissen despite possible adverse political consequences. In the eighth of the article's seventeen paragraphs, the Farrell article states: "The Governor has never run away from Thissen even in the face of strong recommendations by Hanley et al that he would be better off putting some distance between himself and Thissen. This personal loyalty King manifests towards associates never was more apparent than during the recent infighting over a satisfactory racing bill for the industry. Despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners."

There is no disagreement that the legislation to which the article refers is a racing bill which passed the Legislature in the fall of 1981, but which the plaintiff as Governor refused to sign without amendments. Also, it appears to be undisputed that the bill gave the Raynham dog track additional racing dates which competed with the schedule of Keelan's harness race track at Foxborough, and that the plaintiff predicated his approval of the bill on three amendments, one of which would have aided the track at Foxborough by preserving certain dates free of competition from the nearby Raynham and Taunton tracks.

The plaintiff's challenge to the article focuses upon the statement that he did Keelan's "bidding" in connection with the racetrack legislation. Reasonably interpreted, that statement may assert that the position the plaintiff took on that legislation was motivated by loyalty to Keelan, and perhaps by self-interest, rather than by concern for the public good. But, as the judge concluded, and as we said regarding the school prayer cartoon, *supra* at 712, the First Amendment protects as opinion discussion about the motives of public officials. The article does not imply that the plaintiff acted pursuant to a corrupt scheme to obtain personal benefits in exchange for political favors. The article suggests that the plaintiff may have been too tightly bound by personal loyalties, but it makes no implication of corruption.

Finally, we come to the Farrell article published on November 8, 1981, a copy of which appears as Appendix G herein. This article is the subject of the first two counts in the plaintiff's complaint. It is entitled "Ed King's promises not money in bank." The last two paragraphs of the article are as follows: "It has taken some political figures a long time to realize that King operates on a one-way street and regards all other state officials — duly elected constitutional officers, elected legislators, judges and other members of the judiciary — as subordinates of the executive, with their principal function to serve him, the master.

"That condescending attitude never was more in evidence than in October when King called a judge and demanded that

he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case. The judge acquiesced and proved two things: (1) King's original appointment of him was a colossal blunder. (2) He is unfit to remain on the bench."

In the case to which the article referred, five men had pleaded guilty to charges of rape, unnatural rape, and malicious destruction of property, and they had been sentenced. The plaintiff publicly and repeatedly expressed his disapproval of the sentences imposed. He released copies of critical letters he had written to the Administrative Justice of the Superior Court and to the Judicial Conduct Commission. However, for purposes of the summary judgment motion the defendants concede that the plaintiff did not call the sentencing judge.

We agree with the plaintiff, as did the motion judge, that the statement that the plaintiff "called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case" was unambiguously a statement of fact. This was a statement that a specific, verifiable event had occurred. There was neither imprecision in meaning nor anything in the context of the article that suggested that the statement was not factual. Indeed, the statement, in context, functions as factual support for the author's critical characterization of the plaintiff's attitude toward other State officials. These are factors that we have previously recognized as tending to establish a statement as one of fact rather than of opinion for First Amendment purposes. See *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co., supra* at 733-734; *Fleming* v. *Benzaquin*, 390 Mass. 175, 180-181 (1983); *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media, Inc.*, 390 Mass. 51, 60 (1983); *National Ass'n of Gov't Employees, Inc.* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, 379 Mass. 220, 228-229 (1979). Thus, the defendants are not entitled to summary judgment on the ground that the allegedly libelous statement was a statement of constitutionally protected pure opinion.

We proceed, then, to a consideration whether, for summary judgment purposes, the statement in question was nondefamatory, as the judge concluded. "Words may be libellous unless they 'cannot be reasonably understood in a defamatory sense, or, to express it in another way, unless they are incapable of

a defamatory meaning. The test is whether, in the circumstances, the writing discredits the plaintiff in the minds of any considerable and respectable class of the community.' " *Smith* v. *Suburban Restaurants, Inc.*, 374 Mass. 528, 529 (1978), quoting *Muchnick* v. *Post Publishing Co.*, 332 Mass. 304, 305-306 (1955). "If a publication is susceptible of both defamatory and harmless meanings, it presents a question for the trier of fact and cannot be ruled non-libellous as matter of law. . . . Inferences which might be drawn by a considerable and respectable segment of the community can make a publication actionable. . . . Words may be actionable even if they do not tend to damage a plaintiff's reputation or hold him up to ridicule in the community at large or among all reasonable people; it is enough to do so among a considerable and respectable class of people. . . ." (Citations omitted.) *Id.* at 530. See also *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, Inc.*, 367 Mass. 849, 853 (1975).

In concluding that the challenged statement was not susceptible of defamatory meaning, the judge reasoned that *an average reader* would not "judiciously distinguish between the numerous, highly visible actions taken by the plaintiff and the single action falsely attributed to him," and that an average reader would not regard such a telephone call "to complain about an unpopular and controversial decision as reflecting disgrace upon the governor . . . especially . . . where, as here, the plaintiff vigorously undertook a public course of action for which such a call would be a logical (if unsuitable) culmination."

In our view, Farrell's statement that the plaintiff "called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case" was susceptible of a defamatory meaning. A jury would be warranted in finding that, although the general public was unhappy with the judge's decision, a considerable and respectable segment of the community would "judiciously distinguish" between the plaintiff's vigorous and public disagreement with the decision, on the one hand, and the plaintiff's attempt to interfere with the independence of the judiciary, on the other. Furthermore, in light of the fact that the independence

of the judiciary is the cornerstone of a society governed by law, it would not be unreasonable for a jury to conclude that the plaintiff would be discredited in the eyes of that same segment of the community as a result of the false disclosure that he had misused the power of his office in an attempt to pressure the judge to change his decision.

Our final inquiry with respect to Farrell's November 8, 1981, article is whether summary judgment for the defendants is nevertheless appropriate because there is no genuine issue concerning Farrell's "actual malice" in making the statement in question. The plaintiff, as a public figure, cannot recover damages without proving "actual malice." *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 283 (1964). Actual malice is proved "by a showing that the defamatory falsehood was published with knowledge that it was false or reckless disregard of whether it was false." *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, Inc.*, *supra* at 867, citing *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan*, *supra* at 279-280.

In *Celotex Corp.* v. *Catrett*, 106 S. Ct. 2548, 2552-2555 (1986), the Supreme Court held that, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 (c), when a party not having the burden of proof at trial demonstrates that the party having that burden has insufficient evidence to sustain it, the moving party is entitled to summary judgment. As the Court observed, "[o]ne of the principal purposes of the summary judgment rule is to isolate and dispose of factually unsupported claims or defenses." *Id.* at 2553. Even applying the *Celotex Corp.* standard, which we are not bound to do, we are satisfied that the material before the judge demonstrates the availability of clear and convincing evidence of Farrell's reckless disregard for the truth. See *Anderson* v. *Liberty Lobby*, 106 S. Ct. 2505, 2512 (1986); *National Ass'n of Gov't Employees, Inc.* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, 379 Mass. 220, 231 (1979).

The test to determine "reckless disregard" is entirely subjective. *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, Inc.*, *supra* at 867. The Supreme Court has spoken of reckless disregard of the falsity of a defamatory statement as "subjective awareness of probable falsity" (*Gertz* v. *Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323,

335 n.6 [1974]); "high degree of awareness of . . . probable falsity" (*Garrison* v. *Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 64, 74 [1964]), and "awareness of probable falsity" (*Curtis Publishing Co.* v. *Butts*, 388 U.S. 130, 153 [1967]). The Supreme Court has also said that, to raise the question whether a defendant published a defamatory statement with reckless disregard for its falsity, "[t]here must be sufficient evidence to permit the conclusion that the defendant in fact entertained serious doubts as to the truth of his publication. Publishing with such doubts shows reckless disregard for truth or falsity and demonstrates actual malice." *St. Amant* v. *Thompson*, 390 U.S. 727, 731 (1968). In *Bose Corp.* v. *Consumers Union of U.S., Inc.*, 466 U.S. 485, 511 n.30 (1984), the Supreme Court, citing *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan, supra; Gertz* v. *Robert Welch, Inc., supra,* and *St. Amant* v. *Thompson, supra*, again defined actual malice as publication despite serious doubt of the truth of the publication. See also *Herbert* v. *Lando*, 441 U.S. 153, 156 (1979), quoting *St. Amant* v. *Thompson, supra* at 731. This court, too, has quoted *St. Amant* in describing reckless disregard for truth or falsity as "serious doubts as to the truth" of the publication. See *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, Inc., supra* at 867; *Twohig* v. *Boston Herald-Traveler Corp.*, 362 Mass. 807, 810 (1973). We apply that standard here.

As we observed in *Stone, supra* at 867-868, a jury may find that the author of a statement entertained serious doubts about the truth of his or her statement "on the basis of an inference drawn from objective evidence, since it would perhaps be rare for a defendant in such a circumstance to admit to having had serious, unresolved doubts." We must review, then, the materials put before the judge to determine whether, "considered with an indulgence in the plaintiff's favor," they may demonstrate to a jury to a clear and convincing degree the presence of malice on Farrell's part. *Godbout* v. *Cousens, supra* at 258-259. See *Anderson* v. *Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 106 S. Ct. 2505, 2513 (1986).

Our review focuses on the deposition testimony of Farrell and Crane. Farrell testified that State Treasurer Robert Crane was his source, and his only source, for stating that the plaintiff

had called the judge who had presided over the rape trial and demanded that the judge change his decision. Crane testified that, during a luncheon conversation, he had told Farrell that it was Crane's "understanding that the Governor was upset and called the judge, raised hell about it, said it was a lousy decision, and it should be changed." After testifying that he was unable to recall "the language [he] used to Mr. Farrell," Crane was asked, "Now, you said that you told Mr. Farrell that you had heard that Governor King had telephoned [the judge]? Did I understand you correctly?" Crane's answer was, "You did." That evidence would warrant findings that Farrell knew that Crane was not purporting to have personally witnessed the reported conversation, and that he was only repeating what he had been told. From what Crane did not say as well as from what he said, a jury also would be warranted in finding that Crane's statement to Farrell suggested that Crane's source was neither the plaintiff nor the judge.

Crane testified that, when he spoke to Farrell, Crane did not know who his informant had been, and that, at the time he testified, he did not know the informant's identity. Farrell's testimony was that he never asked Crane who Crane's informant had been, that Crane never told him, that Farrell never spoke to the judge to verify the information, and that Farrell never asked anyone else to do so. Farrell also testified that, in his thirty-five years of journalistic experience he had never heard of a similar occurrence, and that he would regard as "serious" a chief executive's demanding that a judge change a decision in a criminal case.

It would be reasonable to infer from the deposition testimony that Farrell, an experienced journalist, published as a fact that the plaintiff had engaged in conduct which, if known, would discredit him in the eyes of a considerable and respectable segment of the community, that Farrell knew that his statement was likely to have that effect, and that he knew that the conduct, if it had occurred, would have been highly unusual. Also, a jury would be warranted in finding that Farrell published the challenged statement without investigation or verification, and with the knowledge that the only information he had was hear-

say, perhaps multi-level, that Crane neither disclosed his source nor vouched for his source's reliability or for the reliability of his source's source, if there was one, and that the report to Crane was as likely to have been fabrication or speculation as to have been the truth.

The Supreme Court has said: "The defendant in a defamation action brought by a public official cannot . . . automatically insure a favorable verdict by testifying that he published with a belief that the statements were true. The finder of fact must determine whether the publication was indeed made in good faith. Professions of good faith will be unlikely to prove persuasive, for example, where a story is fabricated by the defendant, is the product of his imagination, or is based wholly on an unverified anonymous telephone call. Nor will they be likely to prevail when the publisher's allegations are so inherently improbable that only a reckless man would have put them in circulation. Likewise, recklessness may be found where there are obvious reasons to doubt the veracity of the informant or the accuracy of his reports" (footnote omitted). *St. Amant* v. *Thompson, supra* at 732. Here, Farrell had obvious reasons to doubt the veracity and accuracy, not of Crane, but of Crane's undisclosed informant and any other informants in the chain of communication. We are satisfied that the evidence we have discussed would warrant a jury's finding of actual malice by clear and convincing evidence.

The judgment with respect to Counts 3 through 12 is affirmed. The judgment as to Counts 1 and 2 is reversed, and the case is remanded to the Superior Court for trial.

So ordered.

APPENDIX A.

". . . the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Luptill, the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Clifford, the appointment and forced resignation of Thomas DeSilva, the appointment and forced resignation of John Haggerty, the appointment and forced resignation of Barry Locke . . ."

APPENDIX B.

KING SIGNS SCHOOL PRAYER BILL
CRONYISM
PATRONAGE
"SO LET US PREY!"

APPENDIX C.

"ACKERLEY BILLBOARDS CAN PUT MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS TOO!"
LOCKE
ACKERLEY

APPENDIX D.

The old billboard game

Sooner or later, there just had to be the sniff of a billboard scandal. And now there is one and it brings back those good old days when the lobbyist was king and there were always goodies for his pals in the Legislature.

During 10 years that may someday be labeled Massachusetts' "good government decade," the billboard industry has been on the run. Local communities that decided they'd been captive long enough to 672 square-foot huckstering found that state agencies and the courts were backing them up when they moved to get offending signs removed. Some legislators even discovered they could get along without a free lunch or a free billboard just before election time.

It was not that the billboard industry had folded up its barker's stand; it fought every attempt to regulate its excesses and spent a lot of money on lawyers and lobbyists. Yet, while there are still some 1000 billboards standing in violation of local, state, or federal regulations, they have been coming down from the places where people did not want them.

But now, in the space of barely a year, the tide has turned — not because people and local officials got up and objected, demanding that the billboards be put back up, but apparently, as The Globe's Spotlight Team has detailed, because industry money finally reached what must be the right places.

One year ago last August the locally-owned Donnelly Advertising Co., the state's major billboard advertising firm, was bought out for $9 million by Ackerley Communications, one of the nation's largest billboard firms. Ackerley signed up former House Speaker Robert H. Quinn to do its lobbying at the State House. Then, just before the September primary, seven of its executives (and their friends and relatives) discovered Edward J. King, at the time just an underdog candidate for governor, and dropped $7000 into his campaign treasury.

And back out of the Beacon Hill closet come all the old games. A bill zips through the Legislature and into law with King's signature to allow a ski resort billboard to remain despite a court order. King's transportation secretary and close adviser Barry Locke moves to block the removal of 95 billboards that violate the federal highway beautification law. And to top it off — for now, anyway — the administration starts talking about weakening the powers of the watchdog Outdoor Advertising Board.

Meanwhile, the industry is apparently posting or enlarging signs without permits, and providing free billboard space — either knowingly or by a very expensive oversight — to Boston mayoral candidate David Finnegan who just happens to be brother of the House Ways and Means chairman.

And why? Because billboard advertising is a big bucks industry but, curiously, an industry with not much of a constituency and, despite the piteous claims of its State House supporters, with no more than 400 employees at present, according to an industry source.

Those factors prompted the billboard industry to act as it did in the past and the way it apparently will continue to operate until it can be compelled to obey the wishes of local communities and the standards set by local, state, and federal regulations. It will be a hard game to win in a tough league, but the victory will be worth it.

APPENDIX E.

There's a new 'can-do' man in charge

NEWS RELEASE
To: The State House press
Date: Jan. 9, 1980
From: Gov. Edward J. King
Contact: Gov. Edward J. King

Following is a statement from Gov. Edward J. King on the departure of his press secretary, Ronald C. Brinn.

"Good riddance.

"With Ron Brinn out of the administration, the big roadblock is removed. Now I'll be able to get my message out to the people and pal around with reporters the way I tried to all last year. But Ron kept getting in the way.

"Clearly, I could have made the $500 million property tax rollback if Ron had only performed up to par. And talk about patronage! Ron was the one who insisted that I hire Guptill and Clifford and Haggerty and DiSilva and Foster. And now the MBTA's a big headache and Ron's no help — he's a Navy man.

"Ron, in fact, was the hard-boiled grinch who told me to cut off funds to the Pine Street Inn a week before Christmas.

"Clearly, we don't have to look very far to find out why my ratings have been plummeting in the polls. The substance has been terrific; Ron just didn't communicate the image.

"And let's not have any more talk about poor communication between Ron and me, either. It was Ron who insisted last spring that he move his offices down to the nether reaches of the State House — about three bus stops and an elevator ride from me. Ron felt he had been getting too close.

"If Ron wasn't well informed about administration activities, it's not my fault. I told him to read the papers. Somebody in this administration ought to read the papers.

"While we're on bad communications, let's get one thing straight. For all his faults, I didn't fire Ron, or even 'displace' him, as he said. I offered him a perfectly good job handing out press releases in the Saltonstall Building someplace.

"All these months, I've been dying to get friendly with the press, but Ron kept shouldering me aside, wanting the spotlight for himself.

"And people got the wrong idea. When Ron jumped out there to deal with the Guptill and Clifford firings and to face the demonstration of shouting welfare mothers, people thought I was cowering in my office and had fed Ron to the wolves. Actually I was champing at the bit to demonstrate my 'can-do' approach to problem-solving.

"For the sake of accuracy, I must reveal this: Ron is the one with the taste for lobster salad — and tail meat only, please. The Globe smeared me terribly with that picture of a nice, big lobster on Page One. I wanted to talk to the public, to tell the taxpayers the truth — that when they paid $260 for dinner for me and a trooper and Tommy McGee and his wife and his son, it wasn't lobster at all. It was only cold cuts that cost $52 per person.

"I should have learned my lesson early. Marty Burke, my press secretary during the campaign, seemed to be working out until he actually started talking to reporters. Naturally, I had to get rid of him. I tried to set both Marty and Ron straight by embarrassing them in public, but it didn't work.

"Ron turned out to be a big mistake. When I brought him over from MassPort, the most he'd ever done was coordinate press activities at Logan Airport when a DC-9 smashed into the sea wall there. He'd never worked a real disaster.

"Now things will be different. From now on, Ed King will have the best PR man in the business: Ed King."

For a recorded actuality of Gov. Edward J. King reading this press release, call "Dial-a-Governor" — 1-800-632-8222.

Robert L. Turner is a Globe political columnist.

APPENDIX F.

MISSING VIP

David Farrell

When the S.S. Volendam sailed from Commonwealth Pier on Gov. Edward J. King's "Cruise To Nowhere" fundraiser a fortnight ago, there was one VIP missing from the passenger list. David R. (Dick) Thissen, controversial head of the Desmond & Lord architectural firm, which ran aground during a long investigation by the Special Commission on State and County Buildings last year, passed up the opportunity to spend the night in Massachusetts Bay with King, his longtime friend, business partner and vacation companion.

Under normal conditions, Thissen would have been aboard the liner during the all-night bash, which cost contributors to the governor's re-election campaign $200.

But these are not usual times for Thissen, whose hard-pressed firm merged with John Carl Warnecke & Associates two years ago when it became apparent that the probe of Desmond & Lord by the Ward commission was having a devastating effect on D & L's ability to attract new architectural business in this area. Thissen and the new firm's owner, John Carl Warnecke, have collaborated on several architectural jobs awarded Thissen's old firm during the past two decades.

The personable Thissen, once highly visible, has become a political recluse of sorts and is avoiding the spotlight as much as possible. He still swims at the University Club but is seldom seen at many of the haunts he used to frequent.

It wasn't long ago that he and the governor dined on a regular basis at various restaurants in the metropolitan area. But all that has changed because of the adverse impact the Ward commission notoriety has had on Thissen ability's [sic] to generate business for the Warnecke firm.

Except for an occasional fundraiser or wedding reception, the two friends rarely get together, as they once did, at such popular restaurants as Anthony's Pier 4 and Jimmy's Harborside. The last time this occurred was about 10 weeks ago when Secretary of Administration and Finance Edward Hanley invited Thissen to the wedding reception for one of his daughters at Pier 4. That, in itself, was surprising since Hanley has never associated with or been an admirer of Thissen. Hanley privately places much of the blame for the deterioration of King's public image on Thissen.

The governor has never run away from Thissen, even in the face of strong recommendations by Hanley et al that he would be better off putting some distance between himself and Thissen. This personal loyalty King manifests towards associates never was more apparent than during the recent in-fighting over a satisfactory racing bill for the industry. Despite his close associ-

ation with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners.

King still slips out of town with Thissen. They went to Saratoga for the races last August as they do every summer. Over the Easter holidays last spring, they were at the races in Florida. And this Christmas, as they do every Christmas, they are expected to be together in Miami for the winter racing season.

Thissen's pass-up of King's invitation to join him at the Miami Dolphins-Patriots football game here two Sundays ago is indicative of Thissen's plan to make himself more scarce as the 1982 gubernatorial campaign builds.

He is a very close friend and golfing partner of US House Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill Jr., a fact which puts him in an embarrassing middle as the upcoming battle by Lt. Gov. Thomas P. O'Neill 3d to wrest the governorship from King intensifies. Over the three decades since the elder O'Neill was speaker of the Massachusetts House, Thissen has been an intimate.

What makes the situation difficult for Thissen is that O'Neill's son, the lieutenant governor, has been attacking King (and former Gov. Michael S. Dukakis) with increasing tempo of late. As a result, Thissen, who has been a most generous campaign donor to the governor and both O'Neills, will have to sit out the 1982 battle and content himself with giving them equal contributions.

Dukakis, meanwhile, is planning to make the close relationship between King and Thissen part of his own campaign for another term. The ex-governor's campaign strategists are also assuming that the Thissen association with the O'Neill family will not be overlooked by the electorate.

Dukakis is expected to focus on the King-Thissen links, particularly their efforts to undermine and thwart the work of the Ward commission in 1979 and 1980.

Thissen and King still maintain close busines relationships. They are in the coal business with Red Sox players Carl Yastrzemski and Dwight Evans. The four have invested some $300,000, according to Yastrzemski, in a West Virginia coal mine which has not done well. They recently replaced the general manager of coal operations in an effort to get more production and profits.

On the side, Thissen, who always has had a sharp eye for good investments, continues to develop other relationships with men such as Bruins' president Paul Mooney.

Still unresolved and ahead of him is the allegation by the Ward commission that his former firm illegally contributed $1100 to Gov. King's 1978 campaign through a Desmond & Lord secretary. The commission referred that matter to Atty. Gen. Francis X. Bellotti, who is expected to make a decision on it soon.

David Farrell is a Globe political columnist.

APPENDIX G.

Ed King's promises not money in bank

David Farrell

After the controversial Primary Source liquor bill squeaked through the House and Senate at the end of October, chain store owner Freddy Martignetti breathed a sigh of relief. All that he needed was the signature of Gov. Edward J. King.

Martignetti and the governor had discussed the bill and Martignetti's industry problems on several occasions during recent years. And he had King's word that he would sign the measure. That was like having money in the bank.

Martignetti and King had been good friends since their BC High days when Freddy and twin brother Joe met King. The Freddy Martignettis and the Kings socialized over the years, at house parties and other get-togethers. The athletic prowess of the Martignetti children was another bond with the governor, who is well known for his partiality to and idolization of athletes. Most recently, King and Freddy spent considerable time together at the wedding and reception for one of the Martignetti children several weeks ago.

Now for the first time in seven years, Freddy Martignetti could see some daylight in his long battle with the State Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission (ABCC) and the courts over the number of package stores he may legally operate.

Bill's opponents knew their man

The 56-year-old Martignetti knew that the commission decisions which mandated him to get rid of some of his stores because he violated the spirit of the three-store statute would stand, no matter what happened to the Primary Source bill.

But enactment and signing of the measure, whose main provision would bar retail outlets from dealing with out-of-state wholesalers, also would mean that the three-license limit would be scrapped and raised to a seven-license plateau. Martignetti thus would be able to reshuffle his empire and get his business back to the successful peak it enjoyed before the ABCC moved against him.

But while Martignetti, Bruce Wright, Sam Stone and other proponents of Primary Source were laboring so diligently to get the legislation through the House and Senate, opponents, led by Whitehall's Marvin Gordon, came up with a clever strategy that would have appeal only to a governor of King's peculiar makeup.

King was being pressured by public interest groups and some of his own advisers to sign the bottle bill that was so strongly opposed by all liquor interests, Martignetti included, on both sides of the Primary Source controversy. To make it appear that he was seriously weighing the merits of

the bottle bill, King even went to Michigan to review that state's excellent experience with its bottle law.

Since Primary Source had been painted by its opponents as an anti-consumer bill which would hike the price of liquor in Massachusetts and send consumers here to New Hampshire liquor stores, why not blunt the anticipated consumer outrage over a bottle bill veto with a veto of Primary Source? King was asked.

The governor, who had teased the public all summer with his well-orchestrated charade about "rethinking" his previous stand against the bottle bill, jumped at the inviting prospect of mitigating the public outcry against his rejection of the anti-litter legislation with his pitch to the consumer on Primary Source.

It didn't matter to King that the liquor legislation was fashioned by his own special commission and tailored precisely along lines dictated by him. That panel, headed by King's ABCC chairman, John Larkin, labored for months to produce the bill for King.

So it was on the eve of Halloween when Freddy Martignetti learned that Ed King, his pal, planned to veto Primary Source.

"I'm sick. I can't believe it," a stunned Martignetti told everyone he ran into during the next 48 hours.

He couldn't believe that his longtime friend could welch on the commitment and go back on his word. Sure, he had heard some of the many stories about King's unreliability, but he either didn't believe them or didn't want to, on the assumption that his bond with "Eddie" transcended any possibility of a run-out by the governor.

At least he isn't alone

When Martignetti finally got in to see King last Wednesday to discuss the matter, the answer was the same. King tried to soften the blow by suggesting that he could send a special message to take care of Martignetti's package store problem, but Martignetti wasn't taken in, knowing there was no chance such a proposal could survive by itself.

Thus does Martignetti join a growing list of people, many of them former friends of the governor, who have been duped by the chief executive. The list of Walter Hurleys, Paul Heffernans et al is too long to detail in this space. Frank Rich, who grew up with the governor in East Boston, is the most notable of the group. He got burned so often by King's failure to keep his word and commitments that he decided to run against him.

King's next walkout will embrace Quincy Mayor Arthur Tobin, a former state senator who had expected to be appointed clerk/magistrate of Quincy District Court.

When former clerk Dinny Ryan died earlier this year, King confided in intermediaries that Tobin was in the driver's seat for the position. So certain was Tobin of that commitment that he did not seek re-election last week.

But now King has had his faithful servants on his Judicial Nominating Committee come up with another candidate — this one an assistant court

clerk in Plymouth County — and Tobin will be sacrificed. The upcoming bypass of Tobin has worsened the governor's already poor relations in the Senate where Tobin was a popular member. And it has relegated Senate President William M. Bulger's break with King to point-of-no-return status.

Intermediaries have been trying to heal the chasm between Bulger and King, but to no avail. Now their differences are irreconcilable.

In his dealings with the Senate leader, with House Speaker Thomas W. McGee and virtually everyone else in state government, King has demonstrated an attitude which demands total obeisance in exchange for whatever patronage crumbs the governor sees fit to dispense.

It has taken some political figures a long time to realize that King operates on a one-way street and regards all other state officials — duly elected constitutional officers, elected legislators, judges and other members of the judiciary — as subordinates of the executive, with their principal function to serve him, the master.

That condescending attitude never was more in evidence than in October when King called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case. The judge acquiesced and proved two things: 1.) King's original appointment of him was a colossal blunder. 2.) He is unfit to remain on the bench.

David Farrell is a Globe political columnist.

NOLAN, J. (concurring in part and dissenting in part). I agree with the court's determination that the case should be remanded to the Superior Court for trial on counts 1 and 2, the counts in which the plaintiff alleges that he was libeled by the Farrell column of November 8, 1981. I also agree with the court's determination that the Superior Court correctly granted summary judgment with respect to counts 3 through 6 and counts 9 through 12. I disagree, however, with the court's disposition regarding the Ackerley billboard cartoon (Appendix C) which is the subject of counts 7 and 8. Because I think that there is a material issue of fact to be resolved, I dissent from that portion of the court's opinion which affirms the granting of summary judgment on those counts.

A jury question exists in a defamation action if the challenged statement is susceptible of being read by an average reader as either a factual statement or an opinion. *Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 398 Mass. 731, 733 (1986). *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co.*, 380 Mass. 336, 339-340 (1980). A cartoon is subject to the law of libel and, like any other form of depiction, "it may be found libelous if it maliciously presents as fact defamatory material which is false." *Yorty* v. *Chandler*, 13 Cal. App. 3d 467, 472 (1970). See *Russell* v. *McMillen*, 685 P.2d 255, 259 (Colo. Ct. App. 1984); Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 comment d (1977). In *Yorty*, the court suggested that "a political cartoon which falsely depicts a public official selling franchises for personal gain, or a judge taking a bribe, or an attorney altering a public record, or a police officer shooting a defenseless prisoner, will not be exempt from redress under the laws of libel merely because the charge is depicted graphically in linear form rather than verbally in written statement." *Yorty*, *supra* at 472. Such is the nature of the cartoon here. Notwithstanding the facts disclosed in the accompanying editorial, the average reader could have interpreted that cartoon as stating that the Governor and the Secretary of Transportation accepted cash bribes in exchange for taking actions favorable to Ackerley Communications and to the billboard industry. Contrary to the defendants' assertions, nothing in the cartoon suggests that persons associated with Ackerley Communica-

tions merely contributed toward the Governor's campaign. The use of the word "pockets," along with the depiction of bags of cash in the hands of the Governor and the Secretary (who had no campaign fund to accept contributions), could lead the average reader to conclude that Ackerley Communications bribed the Governor and his cabinet secretary. "[W]hen an 'opinion' is something more than a generally derogatory remark [and] is laden with factual content, such as charging the commission of serious crimes, the First Amendment confers no absolute immunity." *Cianci* v. *New Times Publishing Co.*, 639 F.2d 54, 63 (2d Cir. 1980). Since the average reader could have interpreted the cartoon as charging a serious crime, it is for the jury to determine whether the cartoon was in fact defamatory.

I also think there is an issue of fact for the jury on whether the defendants acted with actual malice in publishing the Ackerley cartoon. Actual malice is proved "by a showing that the defamatory falsehood was published with knowledge that it was false or reckless disregard of whether it was false." *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, Inc.*, 367 Mass. 849, 867 (1975). In this case both the cartoonist and the editor of the editorial page were aware that Ackerley had not actually put money in the pockets of the Governor or the Secretary of Transportation, yet neither the cartoonist nor the editor took any steps to disclose this fact in the cartoon. In addition, both the cartoonist and the editor could not remember whether they read the entire news story on which the cartoon was based. If the jury were to conclude that the cartoon made false and defamatory statements of fact, the jury would also be warranted in drawing inferences from these omissions in finding malice. Thus, I would remand the case for trial on the Ackerley cartoon as well as on the Farrell column. "The protection of the freedom of a responsible press does not require that we insulate from liability for libel the artists whose pens drip venom and whose skill in drawing and cartooning far exceeds their sense of responsibility, respect for the truth and the depth of their understanding of public issues." *Yorty, supra* at 479 (Compton, J., concurring in the result).

Appendix B.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss. SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL ACTION
No. 52488

EDWARD J. KING

vs.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY & others[1]

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION ON DEFENDANTS' RENEWED MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Should this defamation action, brought by the plaintiff when he was the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, against the Globe Newspaper Company (Globe), two of its writers and its political cartoonist, go forward to jury trial on any or all of the 12 counts alleged in the Amended Complaint? Or, on the contrary, should the defendants' renewed motion for summary judgment be granted as to some or all of those counts? That is the question which must be decided at this time. After due consideration of the extensive file, the detailed memorandum of counsel, and their oral arguments, I am of the opinion that the defendants are entitled to summary judgment in their favor dismissing all counts.

1. *Procedural background and history.*

The plaintiff commenced this action of libel by filing a Complaint on January 4, 1982. Nine days later he substituted an Amended Complaint, which is in 12 counts, against four

[1] David Farrell; Robert Turner; and Paul Szep.

defendants: (1) Globe Newspaper Company d/b/a the Boston Globe and Boston Sunday Globe, (2) David Farrell, (3) Robert L. Turner, and (4) Paul Szep.

On January 25, 1982, the defendants jointly filed (1) an answer and (2) a motion for summary judgment, accompanied by five affidavits. The motion for summary judgment prompted the plaintiff to move for a continuance. On February 26, 1982, the motion for continuance was allowed.

Thereafter a campaign of discovery by all parties ensued, including interrogatories, requests for production of various documents, a request to admit facts, and a number of oral depositions of both party and non-party deponents.

On August 26, 1982, the plaintiff's motion to further amend his Complaint,[2] assented to, was allowed. Discovery in depth continued.

On March 1, 1983, the plaintiff filed his opposition to the still pending motion for summary judgment, his own affidavit and that of his counsel (with attachments). On March 2, 1983, the motion for summary judgment was denied, without opinion.[3] On April 8, 1983, the defendants filed a motion seeking a rehearing, or, in the alternative, an interlocutory report to the Appeals Court of the legal correctness of the denial of the summary judgment motion, pursuant to Mass. R. Civ. P. 64, and G.L. c. 231, § 111. That motion was denied by the motion judge on June 9, 1983, the order stating that the court "declines to report to the Appeals Court the question if the defendants' motion for summary judgment was properly denied."

---

[2] The second amendment added or substituted new material in paragraphs 37, 45, 52, 60, 82 and 90.

[3] There was, of course, no requirement that the judge hearing the motion (who was not the undersigned justice) give his reasons for denial; it was unnecessary that he find facts or state conclusions of law. Mass. R. Civ. P. 52(a) (last sentence.)

The docket reflects no further activity for the balance of 1983, after the filing of one deposition on July 16; nor is there any further entry herein until more than two years later, when on August 12, 1985, further answers on an oral deposition were filed.

Commencing August 23, 1985, there was substantial renewed activity, with particular emphasis on the taking of a number of oral depositions.[4]

On November 21, 1985, the undersigned justice was specially assigned to all further aspects of the case.[5]

After the assignment was made, I held an informal conference with counsel on November 25, 1985, at which time a target date of March 3, 1986, was fixed for trial.

Thereafter, the parties filed various discovery motions, which prompted a hearing by me on January 13, 1986, a date originally set for a monthly status conference. The several motions were heard and taken under advisement, and subsequently decided.

After a detailed study of the papers on file (during which time [on January 24, 1986] the defendants filed a "Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment" with affidavits and other assorted supporting materials, including a memorandum of law), on January 30, 1986, I issued a "Memorandum and Interlocutory Order #1". That Order provided, *inter alia*, that the court would hold a hearing on various specified issues "as they embody current principles of constitutional law in defamation cases" and likewise provided for the filing by the plaintiff of a statement, in the form of an offer of proof or substantial equivalent, setting forth in detail, count by count, the factual

---

[4] A list of those who have been deposed in this case is attached to this Memorandum as Appendix "A".

[5] The special assignment by the Chief Justice for all further pre-trial and trial proceedings was made pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order No. 9-80, and followed a "Joint Request of the Parties for Special Assignment."

evidence which he proposed and intended to present in support of each of the counts in his Complaint, as most recently amended. It was further directed that the statement should include specific reference to the source of such evidence, i.e. deposition transcript, answer to interrogatory, response to request for admissions, anticipated witness's testimony, etc.. It was further provided that the plaintiff should file at the same time such brief or memorandum (and supporting affidavits, if any) as he desired, stating his position on the several issues designated in the Memorandum and Order. The defendants were given leave to file a seasonable response.

Pursuant to the mandate contained in Interlocutory Order #1, the plaintiff did file a detailed statement, buttressed, by several affidavits and other supporting material, of his factual and legal positions as to each of the counts he has brought, asserting and arguing that as to each count he is entitled to a jury trial. The defendants likewise seasonably filed a response, with factual and legal underpinning.

In accordance with an established schedule, the parties argued their respective positions on March 14, 1986, after which the defendants' Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment was taken under advisement.

2. *The Role of Summary Judgment in Cases Alleging Defamation.*

Summary judgment is properly rendered in a civil action when there is no genuine issue of material fact and when the moving party is entitled to prevail as a matter of law. Mass. R. Civ. P. 56. On motion for summary judgment by a defendant on the ground that a plaintiff has no valid claim, the defendant as moving party has the burden of producing evidence which, considered with an indulgence in the plaintiff's favor, negatives the plaintiff's claim. See *Godbout* v. *Cousens,* 396 Mass. 254, 258 (1985). Where appropriate, our courts have not hesitated to use, and indeed favor, summary disposition in defamation

actions. *Cefalu* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 8 Mass. App. Ct. 71, 74 (1979). "Allowing a trial to take place in a meritless case would put an unjustified and serious damper on freedom of expression." *Appleby* v. *Daily Hampshire Gazette*, 395 Mass. 32, 37 (1985), quoting *National Ass'n of Government Employees* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, 379 Mass. 220, 223 (1979), cert. denied 446 U.S. 935 (1980). Indeed, the "threat of being put to the defense of a lawsuit . . . may be as chilling to the exercise of First Amendment freedoms as fear of the outcome of the lawsuit itself." *Cefalu* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, *supra* at 74, quoting *Washington Post Co.* v. *Keogh*, 365 F.2d 956, 968 (D.C. Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 385 U.S. 1011 (1967). See *Rosenbloom* v. *Metromedia, Inc.*, 403 U.S. 29, 52-53 (1971).

Notwithstanding the important concern for an uninhibited free press expressed in these cases, the appropriateness of summary judgment is somewhat lessened when "actual malice" is the subject to inquiry. As the Supreme Court admonished in oft-cited dicta in *Hutchinson* v. *Proxmire*, 443 U.S. 111, 120 n.9 (1979), proof of a media defendant's subjective awareness of truth or falsity of a challenged statement does not readily lend itself to summary disposition. That does not mean that the non-moving party in a summary judgment motion "is entitled to trial simply because he has asserted a cause of action to which state of mind is a material element." *NAGE* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, *supra* at 231. Traditional rules of procedure, however, require a motion judge to exercise an extra measure of caution in granting summary judgment when resolution of a dispositive issue requires a determination of a state of mind. Nonetheless, "the issue [of actual malice], even though it involves [such] a determination . . . , is not automatically a jury question." *Aarco, Inc.* v. *Baynes*, 391 Mass. 560, 564 (1984). See *Loeb* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 489 F.Supp. 481, 487-488 (D.Mass. 1980). "There must be some indication that [the plaintiff] can produce the requisite quantum of evidence

to enable him to reach the jury with his claim." *Central Broadcasting, supra* at 231.[6]

3. *The Propriety of Again Entertaining the Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.*

As noted above, this case has previously been before the Superior Court on defendants' motion for summary judgment, which was denied on March 2, 1983, with motions for reconsideration and a report each denied. What, then, is the judicial propriety of still another judge now entertaining that motion?

I have determined to entertain the motion, with marked reluctance.[7] A judge should be hesitant to examine (and particu-

---

[6] Precisely what constitutes a "requisite quantum" is the subject of considerable dispute. A summary analysis of libel case law reveals a split among the various state and federal courts as to the standard of proof required at summary judgment to establish the existence of actual malice. Compare, e.g., *Herbert* v. *Lando*, 781 F.2d 298, 305 (2d Cir. 1986) (evidence must be clear and convincing) with *Liberty Lobby* v. *Anderson*, 746 F.2d 1563 (D.C. Cir., 1984) (ordinary summary judgment standards apply). See also *McIntyre* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.*, 479 F.Supp. 808 (D.Mass. 1979). The case law in Massachusetts thus far neither mandates nor proscribes the application of the "convincing clarity" standard of proof at summary judgment. The court's consideration of the matter has mostly occurred in the context of cases suffering the same fatal flaw, viz., the absence of any evidence directly or inferentially demonstrating actual malice; and thus these cases warranted summary disposition under the standard of proof ordinarily applied. *Godbout* v. *Cousens*, 396 Mass. 254 (1985); *Aarco, Inc.* v. *Baynes*, 391 Mass. 560 (1984); *NAGE* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp., supra*. Cf. *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media*, 390 Mass. 51 (1983) (summary judgment reversed where "sufficient quantum of evidence" averred). I note with interest a curious footnote in *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co., Inc.*, 380 Mass. 336 (1980). In footnote 5, the court indicates in dicta that a basis for its decision in *Central Broadcasting* was that the plaintiff "had not known *sufficiently clear and convincing envidence* from which a jury could find actual malice." At 340-341 (emphasis added). Nonetheless, absent a clear pronouncement from a higher authority on this matter, I will apply to the present case the lesser standard of "some indication" to the extent that it is necessary to do so.

[7] These are the same considerations which I articulated in my "Memorandum and Interlocutory Order #1." I repeat them here so that my thinking in this regard will be contained in this Memorandum, dispositive of the issues.

larly to undo) the work of another judge. It is undoubtedly appropriate to honor what a colleague has ordered earlier in a case. But, though there is no duty to reconsider a case, an issue, or a question of fact or law once decided, the power to do so remains in the court until final decision. It does not matter that a different judge heard the question before; it is open to another judge to review and modify, or even vacate, a prior order, if deviation from the first order is called for in the light of subsequent events, the public interest, or the interests of the parties. Deference to a colleague's rulings is a practice, not an inflexible rule. See *Commonwealth* v. *Carrunchio,* 20 Mass. App. Ct. 943, 944 (1985); *Serody* v. *Serody,* 19 Mass. App. Ct. 411, 412 (1985); and cases cited in both those decisions.

Here I find many compelling reasons for a court to take a "fresh look" at certain of the issues raised.

(1). Judicial resources for the trial of civil cases with juries are scarce.[8] Four-week trials entail lengthy service of juror-citizens, and prevent the hearing and disposition of other cases. Before commencing such a trial the trial judge should be reasonably confident that the facts which are likely to be proved, in the light of the law applicable to such facts, will result in eventual jury issues. Otherwise, the precious time expended in prolonged trials ending in directed verdicts or dismissals is squandered. Especially in defamation cases the court should be persuaded that there is probable cause for a jury to consider and decide.

(2). Trial judges have a particular duty to scrutinize the defamation case, and to insure so far as is possible that constitutional requirements in this area are met, before submitting issues to a jury.

---

[8] At the commencement of 1986 there were pending in Suffolk County alone 20,185 civil actions to be tried. Approximately 50% entail claimed jury trials.

(3). The constitutional law of defamation is still evolving and being shaped by both Massachusetts and federal courts. In the three years which have elapsed since the motion for summary judgment was denied, there have been many appellate decisions which have added to the body of law in this area. This case should be re-examined in the light of those principles.

(4). This case is a prototypical public official against newspaper case. *Times* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964). As such it necessarily implicates constitutional issues of importance and subtlety.

(5). The challenged publications are several in number. They consist not only of editorials and articles, but also of political cartoons. Different concepts may be applicable depending upon the category of publication involved.

(6). In particular, a pre-trial judicial analysis should be made as to the following issues, given the expected evidence at trial: whether a publication consists of protected expression of opinion; whether it is defamatory or not; whether it involves any undisclosed or assumed defamatory facts; and finally, if other prerequisites are met, whether the defendants published a defamatory falsehood with "constitutional malice", i.e. with knowledge of falsity or in reckless disregard of whether it was false.

(7). As detailed above, the parties have by now, through extensive discovery proceedings, investigated the facts far beyond the point reached when the motion for summary judgment was heard in 1983. They have extensively outlined what the reasonably expected trial evidence will be. A judge in 1986 is now in a better position to evaluate the case upon current constitutional principles.

All of these reasons, among others, have militated in favor of a re-examination of the basic legal issues in this case, as applied to the challenged publications, before any prolonged trial takes place. I now make such a re-examination.

4. *The Format of This Memorandum.*

After discussing the law applicable to matters of opinion and fact as they relate to political cartoons, political editorials and articles, and political satire, I shall then proceed to analyze the plaintiff's several claims for relief, which fall into three separate categories[9]:

1. The *Szep* Cartoons (and a connected editorial)[10]
   (Counts VII through XII)
2. The *Turner* Satirical Column
   (Counts V and VI)
3. The *Farrell* Articles
   (Counts I through IV)

5. *The Applicable Law as to Opinion and Fact with Reference to Political Cartoons, Political Satire, etc.*

Like any other published statement, a humorous statement (whether it be a cutting political cartoon, an acerbic satire, or any other form) which expresses an opinion on a public issue may sustain an action for libel if it is based on a false statement of known or assumed fact or on undisclosed defamatory facts of which the reader is unaware. See Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 (1977). While "humor is a protected form of free speech, just as much to be given full scope, under appropriate circumstances, as the political speech, the journalistic expose, or the religious tract," *Salomone* v. *Macmillan Pub. Co. Inc.*, 411 N.Y.S.2d 105, 108 (1978), it is not categorically protected by the First Amendment. As an Irish court noted many years

---

[9] Each count against the individual author, viz. Farrell, Turner, Szep, is paired with the equivalent count against the defendant Globe Newspaper Company, which is charged with liability on *respondeat superior* principles. There is no question but that the corporate defendant is liable here, if the employee is; and that, if the employee is not, then the employer newspaper is not liable. For convenience, hereafter, the collective term "defendants" is often used, without specification as to which individual defendant is involved.

[10] One Szep cartoon is logically paired with a companion editorial ("The Old Billboard Game"), and, accordingly, the two are treated together.

ago, "The principle is clear that a person shall not be allowed to murder another's reputation in jest." *Donoghue* v. *Hayes* (1831), Hayes, Irish Exch. 265, 266, quoted in *Salomone, supra* at 109. Thus, a humorist or satirist who publishes a statement to make a defamatory point may be exposed to liability under the law of libel. Similarly, the publisher of a cartoon is not exempt from redress "merely because the charge is depicted graphically in linear form rather than verbally in written statement." *Yorty* v. *Chandler,* 13 Cal App. 3d 467 (1971). The plaintiff, however, must show that the challenged cartoon contained "a false statement of facts as distinguished from opinion, which is protected by the first amendment." *Keller* v. *Miami Herald Pub. Co.,* 778 F.2d 711, 715 (11th Cir. 1985). The humorous context in which the alleged libel appears will be probative that the statements were opinion rather than fact. *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co.,* 380 Mass. 336 (1980). A brief outline of the law concerning the distinction between fact and opinion is thus in order.

The Supreme Judicial Court has had frequent occasion to define the contours of the opinion/fact dichotomy in an action of defamation. *Pritsker* v. *Brudnoy,* 389 Mass. 776 (1983); *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.,* 386 Mass. 303 (1982), cert. denied, 103 S. Ct. 449 (1983); *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co.,* 380 Mass. 336 (1980); *National Ass'n. of Gov't. Employees* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.,* 379 Mass. 220 (1979), cert. denied, 446 U.S. 935 (1980). It is a determination which that court has deemed "critical." *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.,* 386 Mass. 303, 308 (1982). "In this context courts apply the Constitution by carefully distinguishing between statements of opinion and fact, treating the one as constitutionally protected and imposing on the other civil liability for its abuse." *Cole* at 308-309, quoting *Gregory* v. *McDonnell Douglas Corp.,* 17 Cal. 3d 596, 601 (1976). The Superior Court has acknowledged that opinions are accorded a

special status in the free flow of public discourse: "[H]owever pernicious an opinion may seem, we depend for its correction not on the conscience of judges and juries but on the competition of other ideas." *Gertz* v. *Robert Welch Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 339-340 (1974).

The courts in the various jurisdictions appear to be agreed that the fact/opinion determination is a question of law to be decided by the trial judge. *Cole, supra* at 309; *Rinaldi* v. *Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.*, 421 N.Y. 2d 369, 381, cert. denied, 434 U.S. 969 (1977); *Henry* v. *Halliburton*, 690 S.W. 2d 775 (Mo. 1985); *Bucher* v. *Roberts*, 198 Colo. 1, 3 (1979); *Gregory* v. *McDonnell Douglas Corp.*, 17 Cal. 3d 596, 601 (1976); *Keller* v. *Miami Herald Pub. Co.*, 778 F.2d 711, 715 (11th Cir. 1985). As enunciated by our own courts, the test to be applied in deciding whether statements can be understood reasonably as fact or opinion

> requires that the court examine the statement in its totality in the context in which it was uttered or published. The court must consider all the words used, not merely a particular phrase or sentence. In addition, the court must give weight to cautionary terms used by the person publishing the statement. Finally, the court must consider all of the circumstances surrounding the statement, including the medium by which the statement is disseminated and the audience to which it is published.

Cole, 386 Mass. at 309, quoting from *Information Control Corp.* v. *Genesis One Computer Corp.*, 611 F.2d 781, 784 (9th Cir. 1980). See *Fleming* v. *Benzaquin*, 390 Mass. 175, 180-181 (1983). Although the initial determination is one of law, if the trial judge concludes that the challenged remarks are not unambiguously fact or opinion but instead could be understood by the average reader to be either, the issue must be left to the jury's determination. *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co., Inc.*, 380 Mass. 333, 340 (1980).

The inquiry does not end in the event the trial judge determines as a matter of law that an allegedly libelous statement is unambiguously an opinion, thus meriting constitutional protection. The judge must next consider the distinction expressed in the Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 (1977), as adopted by our courts, between "pure" opinion and "mixed" opinion. The former category comprises those opinions based upon disclosed or assumed non-defamatory facts.[11] A "pure" opinion by itself is not actionable no matter how unjustified and unreasonable the opinion may be or how derogatory it is. *Pritsker* v. *Brudnoy*, 389 Mass. 776, 778 (1983). This is so because readers can interpret the disclosed or assumed factual statements and decide for themselves whether the writer's opinion is justified. On the other hand, a "mixed" opinion is actionable if the comment is reasonably understood as implying the existence of undisclosed facts about the plaintiff, defamatory in character, in order to justify the opinion. *Id.*

The plaintiff here maintains that each article and cartoon constitutes a false statement of fact, actionable in itself, or, alternatively, constitutes an actionable statement of opinion based upon undisclosed defamatory facts. Thus, I am confronted with two important threshold questions that are proper for determination at this stage of the litigation: first, whether each allegedly libelous statement can reasonably be read as a statement of fact, or is rather an expression of opinion; and, second, whether the expression of opinion, if unambiguously found, is capable of bearing a defamatory meaning because it

[11] According to comment b following § 566, a fact is "disclosed" when "the maker of the comment states the facts on which he bases his opinion of the plaintiff and then expresses a comment as to the plaintiff's conduct, qualifications, or character." A fact is "assumed" when "the maker of the comment does not himself express the alleged facts on which he bases the expression of opinion [but] both parties to the communication know the facts or assume their existence and the comment is clearly based on those assumed facts and does not imply the existence of other facts in order to justify the comment."

may reasonably be understood to imply the assertion of undisclosed defamatory facts that justify the opinion. The challenged statements are to be "taken in their natural sense, and without a forced or strained construction . . .". *Myers, supra* at 341, quoting *Peck* v. *Wakefield Item Co.*, 280 Mass. 453 (1932); compare *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media*, 390 Mass. 51, 60-61 (1983).

6. *The Szep Cartoons.*

A. *The March 12, 1981 "Appointments" Cartoon*[12] (Counts IX and X)

This cartoon depicts the plaintiff attired in a pinstripe suit, a black shirt, and a white tie upon which the words "Can Do" appear, holding a hat with a pin-wheel, and handcuffed to a police officer who is reading off to a desk sergeant a list of the plaintiff's controversial political appointments: ". . . [T]he appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Guptill, the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Clifford, the appointment and forced resignation of John Haggerty, the appointment and forced resignation of Barry Locke . . ."

In claiming that the cartoon is defamatory, the plaintiff contends that it states as fact that he was a criminal or had the mental state of a criminal; that he had appointed the named individuals knowing of their criminal or unethical conduct; that he was guilty of misconduct and maladministration; and that he was possibly subject to impeachment.

Having examined the cartoon in light of the guiding principles discussed above, and bearing in mind the appropriate standards to be applied at this stage of the litigation, I conclude that an average reader could not reasonably interpret the cartoon as conveying the facts which the plaintiff has articulated. Indeed, the strictly literal interpretation that the plaintiff urges does not comport with any reasonable interpretation of the

---

[12] A copy of this cartoon is attached to this Memorandum as Appendix "B".

evidence in this case. Instead, I view the cartoon as unambiguously expressing the cartoonist's own opinion through the use of "artistic rhetorical hyperbole," a common device of the political cartoonist and, as such, I conclude that it cannot reasonably be viewed as stating a fact. *Myers, supra* at 340 and nn. 4, 5. Thus, the cartoon is not actionable.

In *Keller* v. *Miami Herald Pub. Co., supra,* the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals analyzed a cartoon similar in certain visual respects to Szep's "appointments" cartoon. The *Keller* cartoon depicted a nursing home, then the focus of considerable public attention and owned by the plaintiff Keller, in a state of total disrepair. Three men in that cartoon, one of whom might reasonably have portrayed the plaintiff Keller, are dressed like gangsters and carry bags of money. The complaint in *Keller* alleged that the plaintiff there had been defamed because the cartoon inaccurately depicted physical conditions at the nursing home, and because the cartoon falsely identified him as a criminal. The court disagreed, stating that "[n]o one could reasonably have considered the cartoon here as portraying the actual conditions [at the nursing home] . . . . Likewise, it would have been unreasonable to interpret the cartoonist as alleging that [the plaintiff] was involved in specific criminal activity or was a member of organized crime merely because the three men in the cartoon were dressed like gangsters." At 716. In taking note of the nature of political or editorial cartoons as a medium of expression, the *Keller* court recognized that "[c]artoonists employ hyperbole, exaggeration, and caricature to communicate their messages to the reader. One cannot reasonably interpret a cartoon as literally depicting an actual event or situation." *Id.* Thus, viewed through the cartoonist's lens of exaggeration and fancy, the publicized disrepair at the nursing home becomes the flagrant dilapidation depicted, and the plaintiff's profit from the nursing home is expressed loosely and figuratively in the gangster caricature.

Taking into consideration "the medium by which the statement is disseminated," *Cole, supra* at 309, enlightened by the insights of the Eleventh Circuit noted above, I can only conclude that Szep's "appointments" cartoon is no more than a graphic expression of his views and opinions that the plaintiff Governor was responsible for numerous ill-advised political appointments. No reasonable viewer would consider it a factual report that the plaintiff had been arrested, handcuffed, and charged, or was a criminal, or knew of criminal or unethical conduct of his appointees before their selection. Even if the plaintiff's depicted attire is that of the criminal underworld,[13] Szep was clearly using the gangster caricature "in a loose, figurative sense." *Old Dominion Branch No. 496, Nat'l. Assoc. of Letter Carriers* v. *Austin*, 418 U.S. 264, 284 (1974). The reading of the charges, the handcuffs, and the other cited details must fall within that category which the courts have called "rhetorical hyperbole." See *Greenbelt Cooperative Publishing Ass'n* v. *Bresler*, 398 U.S. 6, 14 (1970) (publisher used term "blackmail" to characterize negotiating position of public figure in heated city council meetings); *Miller* v. *Charleston Gazette*, 9 Media L. Rep. 2540, 2545 (W. Va. Cir. Ct. 1983) (cartoon allegedly suggested offensive sexual impropriety on the part of plaintiff).[14]

---

[13] As was said in *Cohen* v. *New York Herald Tribune, Inc.*, 310 NYS 2d 709, 721 (1970), "These unflattering characterizations of the plaintiff were stylistic and satirical touches of the author's piquant pen."

[14] For other cases in which editorial and political cartoons were held to constitute protected expressions of opinion, see *Franklin* v. *Friedman*, 12 Media L. Rep. 1146 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1985) (comic strip depicted well-known talk show host as visibly shrinking physically and ultimately being fired from his job); *Russell* v. *McMillen*, 685 P.2d 255 (Colo. Ct. App. 1984) (cartoon, published with an article and editorial, implied that a transaction involved profit to a public official under questionable circumstances); *Silberman* v. *Georges*, 456 N.Y.S. 2d 395 (N.Y. App. Div. 1982) (painting allegedly equated plaintiffs with muggers and robbers and accused them of criminal activity); *Walker* v. *Southeastern Newspapers*, 9 Media L. Rep. 1516 ([Ga.] 1982)

The plaintiff fares no better in his contention that the cartoon is an expression of mixed opinion, i.e. is based upon undisclosed defamatory facts, which therefore does not share in the First Amendment protection accorded pure opinion. The undisclosed facts alleged by him basically include those discussed above as disclosed facts, in addition to the newly introduced "facts" that plaintiff is an individual of low intelligence, and that he ignored information about the appointees provided him by investigators. "It is the function of the court to determine whether an expression of opinion is capable of bearing a defamatory meaning because it may reasonably be understood to imply the assertion of undisclosed facts that justify the expressed opinion about the plaintiff or his conduct . . ." Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566, comment c at 173 (1977), quoted in *Cole, supra* at 313. The considerable publicity generated by the various resignations formed the disclosed factual basis for Szep's opinion. The unrevealed facts suggested by the plaintiff are either not facts susceptible of verification (his "low intelligence") or not implied (his "criminality" or state of mind). The cartoon simply cannot bear the defamatory meaning which the plaintiff would assign to it.[15]

(cartoons allegedly conveyed impression that Human Relations Commission executive director was guilty of misappropriating commission funds); *Yorty* v. *Chandler*, 91 Cal. Rptr. 709 (1970) (cartoon allegedly depicted Mayor as mentally deranged and in need of a straight jacket). See also *Wefler* v. *Indianapolis Newspapers*, 7 Media L. Rep. 1876 (Ind. 1981); *Ferguson* v. *Dayton Newspapers*, 7 Media L. Rep. 1396 (Ohio Ct. of Common Pleas 1981). Here the plaintiff has pointed to no decision in which such a cartoon has been held actionable.

[15] Citing *Schrottman* v. *Barnicle*, 386 Mass. 627 (1982), the plaintiff maintains that, since characterizations of a person's state of mind constitute statements of fact, the defendants' "misrepresentation of plaintiff's state of mind misrepresents a statement of fact, even though it is an opinion." Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Fact, p. 139. I do not agree with the plaintiff's rendering of *Schrottman*, nor do I find any support or clarification in the law for the proposition relied upon here. Questioning the attitudes, motives, beliefs, and values of political leaders partakes of the uninhibited, robust, and wide-open debate on public issues which the courts are constitutionally bound to protect.

For these reasons, I conclude that the expression in the cartoon about the plaintiff was a pure opinion and, therefore, protected from this libel suit by the First Amendment.

B. *The November 9, 1979, "School Prayer Bill" Cartoon*[16] (Counts XI and XII)

This Szep cartoon is entitled "KING SIGNS SCHOOL PRAYER BILL" and depicts the plaintiff at a desk signing what could reasonably be regarded as the so-called school prayer bill. He is flanked by two symbolic figures labelled, respectively, "Patronage" and "Cronyism". "Patronage" carries in his left-hand pocket a satchel bearing the caption "pay raise." "Cronyism" appears to hold the plaintiff's arm as the latter signs the school bill. In front of "Cronyism" are packets of dollar bills. The caption to the cartoon reads, "SO LET US PREY!"

The plaintiff maintains that the cartoon falsely states as fact that he signed the school prayer bill, and did so for corrupt, improper, or wrongful motives; and that he signed the school prayer bill or the pay raise bill, or both, in return for cash payments. Again, largely for the reasons stated in the preceding section, I am constrained by the materials before me to conclude that a jury could not reasonably find that the cartoon stated the "facts" which he posits. Even the most careless reader would have to perceive that the cartoon is an allegory, using persons, visual metaphor, and symbols "to convey a hidden meaning extracted by a reasoning process." *Miller* v. *Charlestown Gazette*, 9 Media L. Rep. 2540, 2545 (W. Va. Cir. Ct. 1983). The statements contained in it obviously are no more, again, than the cartoonist's rhetorical hyperbole, used to express vigorously his opinion about a relationship between two official decisions made by the plaintiff, rather than to convey the hard factual details of a corrupt transaction. Overstatement is the cartoonist's stock in trade. That the plain-

[16] A copy of this cartoon is attached to this Memorandum as Appendix "C".

tiff's eyes are cast heavenward as he signs the purported legislation cannot reasonably be read as a factual statement about his religious beliefs. Nor can the image of "Cronyism" holding, or even twisting, his arm be reasonably interpreted as an accusation by the defendants that bribery, extortion, or any other untoward conduct literally took place at the signing. See *Silberman* v. *Georges,* 456 N.Y.S. 2d 395 (N.Y. App. Div. 1982). Moreover, the caption "SO LET US PREY!" is obviously intended as a pun on the homophonetic words "pray" and "prey." When the caption is read in tandem with the allegorical figures depicted, the fanciful, fictional nature of the presentation is manifest. I rule that the statements contained in the cartoon could only be found to be opinion.

Alternatively, the plaintiff points to alleged underlying facts, undisclosed in the cartoon, which he says form the basis for the opinion expressed there. In addition to reiterating and expanding the disclosed "facts" discussed above, the plaintiff adds the following asserted "facts": he signed the school prayer bill and/or the pay raise bill because his "cronies" wanted him to; he was preying on the public by enacting legislation for monetary compensation; he hypocritically signed the bill; his religious beliefs are insincere; he did not act of his own free will, and is a dupe for other interests; and he received monetary compensation in exchange for his signature. These allegations add nothing to the merits of his claim. As was true in *Keller* (at 718), "the facts surrounding the . . . affair had been well-publicized so that the [newspaper's] readers were aware of the series of events upon which the cartoonist based his opinion." The alternative set of "facts" put forth here are, again, either not *factual* at all (his religious insincerity, his hypocrisy, his preying on the public), cannot be reasonably inferred from the cartoon (he received cash payments for his signature), or are too vague and imprecise to bear the alleged defamatory meaning (he is a "dupe" who acted in behalf of "cronies"). The

cartoon is a pure expression of opinion that merits the full protection of the First Amendment. The plaintiff's claim as to this cartoon is simply not actionable under current constitutional and other decisional principles.

C. *The October 18, 1979, "Billboard" Editorial and related Szep Cartoon* (Counts VII and VIII)

On October 17, 1979, the Globe published an article prepared by its Spotlight Team of investigative reporters which detailed the King Administration's relationship with the billboard industry. The Spotlight piece (which is not a part of the plaintiff's Complaint) reported efforts by Cabinet Secretary Barry Locke to protect and preserve certain billboards slated for removal. The article also reported that industry officials, friends, and relatives had contributed to the plantiff's 1978 gubernatorial election campaign. On October 18, 1979, the Globe published an editorial written by reporter Michael Kenney and a political cartoon drawn by the defendant Szep, both of which relied upon and drew from the investigative article. Specifically, the editorial reiterated a statement in the investigative report that a bill had passed into law "with King's signature" allowing a certain billboard to remain despite a court order to the contrary. In fact, pursuant to the Massachusetts Constitution[18], the bill passed into law without the Governor's signature. The editorial also noted, as reported in the investigative piece, that "seven of [Ackerley Communication's] executives (and their friends and relatives) discovered Edward J. King . . . and dropped $7,000 into his campaign treasury."

The *Szep* cartoon depicts a billboard on which the plaintiff and Barry Locke are pictured holding sacks inscribed with

---

[17] Copies of this editorial and of the Szep cartoon are attached to this Memorandum as Appendices "D" 1 and 2, respectively.

[18] See Massachusetts Constitution, Part II, c. 1, § 1, Art. 11.

dollar signs. An inscription on the billboard reads, "Ackerley Billboards can put money in your pocket too!"

Turning first to the cartoon, I conclude once again that the defendants here enjoy the guarantee of the First Amendment protecting the expression of opinion. The statement of fact allegedly contained in the cartoon cannot logically be the literal scene depicted, i.e., that the plaintiff and Locke appeared on a public billboard holding sacks emblazoned with dollar signs. The alleged facts figuratively conveyed by the cartoon (that the plaintiff and Locke received personal cash contributions and/or payoffs from Ackerley) simply do not flow from a form of expression that clearly draws upon overstatement and extravagant symbolism to make its point. The cartoon implies nothing more than Szep's editorial judgment that the plaintiff's association with Ackerley raised questions of public concern. Moreover, this expression of opinion cannot reasonably be found to be based on undisclosed defamatory facts of which the reader is unaware. The investigative article published the previous day amply disclosed the facts upon which Szep formed his opinion. See *Russell* v. *McMillen*, 685 P.2d 255, 259 (Colo. Ct. App. 1984) (cartoon depicting public figure receiving money under questionable circumstances was symbolic expression of opinion espoused in accompanying article and editorial). See also *Gouthro* v. *Gilgun*, 12 Mass. App. Ct. 591, 592 (1981); *Walker* v. *Southeastern Newspapers*, 9 Med. L. Rep. 1516 (1982); *Okun* v. *Superior Court of Los Angeles County*, 629 P.2d 1369 (Cal. 1981).

For similar reasons the statements contained within the editorial entitled "The Old Billboard Game" fall within the ambit of protected opinion. Expressly based upon the Spotlight Team's investigative report of the previous day, the editorial is a critical, disapproving, and perhaps cynical commentary inveighing against the billboard industry's lobbying and business practices. The alleged defamatory statments occur in this context. Labelling the period prior to the plaintiff's tenure as

"the good government decade" is unquestionably an expression of pure opinion, as is any implication that his administration was contrastingly "corrupt and evil". Commenting that "industry money finally reached what must be the right places" is not a factual assertion of a crime but, rather, a moral criticism of objectives and methods. See *Okun* v. *Superior Court of Los Angeles County, supra* at 1379. The asserted nexus between the industry's campaign contributions to his gubernatorial campaign and subsequent actions of the plaintiff and his administration is well within the bounds of protected political discourse. "A statement regarding (1) a public official's business, social, or political affiliations, and (2) how those affiliations seem reflected in decision-making hardly constitutes a libelous charge of bribery and corruption." *Okun* at 1374. Referring to the plantiff as an "underdog" at the time of the contributions, even if capable of verification, is not in and of itself defamatory. Moreover, none of the statements viewed within their context implies the allegation of undisclosed defamatory facts as a basis. See *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, 386 Mass. 303, 313 (1982). As with the cartoons, the investigative piece disclosed the facts relied upon.

D. "*Actual Malice*" *and the Cartoons*

The plaintiff contends that Szep prepared each of his cartoons with knowing falsehood or reckless disregard of the truth of the statements, inferences, and innuendoes said to stem from them. Since I have concluded that the cartoons and the one accompanying editorial all fall within the protected area of opinion, I need not consider whether the defendants published the cartoons with actual malice as that phrase has been constitutionally defined. I pause here, however, to make the following brief observations.

a) The plaintiff points to Szep's statement, quoted in the American Bar Association Journal of January 1, 1986, as evidence of an impermissible intent on the latter's part in drawing the challenged cartoons. (Referring to the role of the political

cartoonist, Szep was correctly quoted as stating, "If you are doing your job properly, you are being malicious every day.") It can hardly be said that this comment amounts to objective evidence from which a jury could reasonably infer "actual malice". "'Actual malice' is a term of art, created to provide a convenient shorthand expression for the standard of liability that must be established before a State may constitutionally permit public officials to recover for libel in actions brought against publishers." *Cantrell* v. *Forest City Publishing*, 419 U.S. 245 (1974). It seems all too clear that Szep was not giving a constitutional dimension to what he perceives to be an inherent attribute of his vocation. The ordinary use of a word that carries both legal and colloquial meaning need not be a perilous affair. In saying that an effective cartoonist must be "malicious" every day, Szep could not reasonably be understood to mean that cartoonists must of necessity draw with knowing falsity or with recklessness on a daily basis.

The plaintiff further argues that the comment evidences Szep's ill will, i.e. his "common law malice", which may be introduced as evidence of constitutional malice. Even assuming that ill will can be considered as an element of actual malice (but see *Gouthro* v. *Gilgun*, 12 Mass. App. Ct. 591, 593 n.4 [1981]), Szep's characterization of his world view as a cartoonist is hardly an admission as to his state of mind regarding *this* plaintiff and *these* cartoons.

b) Even if I were to read the cartoons as figuratively stating the facts alleged by the plaintiff, I find no evidence in the record before me from which a jury could reasonably infer actual malice. The meaning that the plaintiff would find in Szep's "school prayer" cartoon (a charge that he participated in bribery and corruption) is not made more plausible by Szep's knowledge of Thomas Nast's reknowned vitriolic cartoons of an earlier era. That Szep is creatively indebted ("So let us prey" was originally a Nast caption) to a reknowned cartoonist

who sometimes depicted corruption, is not relevant to Szep's state of mind regarding this plaintiff. As to the "billboard" cartoon, the plaintiff has not shown that Szep's figurative depiction of a fact (the actual instance of a corrupt transaction) was made with "serious doubts as to the truth of [the] publication." *St. Amant* v. *Thompson,* 390 U.S. 727, 731 (1968). Szep's inability to definitively recall reading the entire Spotlight Team article does not signal the presence in his mind of "serious doubts". The "fact" which the plaintiff urges upon this court as being expressed in the "appointments" cartoon (that he knowingly appointed persons with unsavory backgrounds) simply does not appear upon any reasonable viewing of the work. That Szep composed the cartoon without knowing what the plaintiff knew about his appointees is immaterial since the cartoon cannot reasonably be interpreted as depicting what the plaintiff knew and when he knew it.

7. *The January 10, 1980, Robert Turner Column*[19]
(Counts V and VI)

The alleged defamatory article appeared in Turner's regularly featured column entitled "Political Circuit" under Turner's by-line. The column contained a mock, though realistic-appearing, press release purportedly issued by Governor King in which he discusses in detail his problems with his recently resigned press secretary, Ronald Brinn, and with the press generally; and in which he announces his own appointment as his new press secretary.

Use of the technique of satire does not alter the analysis set out in the preceding sections of this Memorandum. The threshold inquiry remains "whether the communication in question could reasonably be understood in a defamatory sense by those who received it." *Polygram Records* v. *Superior Court,*

---

[19] The full text of this column is attached to this Memorandum as Appendix "E".

216 Cal. Rptr. 252, 259 (Cal. App. 1985). "The particular style of writing involved is part of the 'context' to be examined when determining whether the statement could reasonably be understood as an assertion of fact." *Lane* v. *Arkansas Valley Publishing*, 9 Media L. Rep. 1726, 1728 (Colo. Ct. App. 1982). As with other forms of writing, if a satirical writing reasonably implies "the assertion of a factual charge that would be defamatory if made expressly," Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 Comment d, it is protected by the cloak of constitutional privilege. *Pring* v. *Penthouse International, Ltd.*, 695 F.2d 438 (10th Cir. 1982); *Lane* v. *Arkansas Valley Publishing, supra*. On the other hand, a statement that is "obvious satire" cannot reasonably be susceptible of a libelous meaning. *Moreno* v. *Time, Inc.*, 11 Media L. Rep. 2196, 2199 (NY Sup. Ct. 1985); *Salomone* v. *Macmillan Pub. Co., Inc.*, 411 N.Y.S. 2d 105 (1978).

The plaintiff complains that he never issued the press release attributed to him or made any of the statements contained therein. Of course, he did not. Further, he argues that, since Turner admits the falsity of the attributions made in his simulated press release, the statements as a result must be factual, since opinions cannot by definition be proven false. I do not agree with this argument. The attempt to prove logically that the article as a whole and in its segments constitutes fact rather than opinion is strained because it fails to appreciate that the article must be examined "in its totality in the context in which it was . . . published." *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co., Inc.*, 380 Mass. 336, 341 (1980). In *Lane* v. *Arkansas Valley Publishing, supra,* the newspaper's column purported to quote from a letter attributed to the plaintiff in that case, a controversial county commissioner. The letter, a satirical piece authored by the columnist, referred to a new, military-type county personnel code and to an incident involving "secret meetings" (both topics had been the subject of extensive public con-

troversy), and was purportedly signed by the plaintiff commissioner as "Supreme Commander." The *Lane* court held:

> Taken out of context, the article appears to assert that [the plaintiff] was the author of such a letter. Although admittedly false, that in itself is not actionable libel because the context of the letter must be considered to determine whether it may reasonably be understood to imply the assertion of fact. As with *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co., Inc.* . . ., the format and language indicates the letter was a tongue-in-cheek effort to portray the author's opinion of [the plaintiff's] personnel policies and conduct of office. The factual basis for the opinion is disclosed in the article.

Id. at 1729. The court affirmed the entry of summary judgment with respect to that article.

The context of Turner's satirical column here makes clear that it could not reasonably be understood to imply the assertion of fact. An ordinary reader would immediately notice that the column appears under the title of Turner's feature column ("Political Circuit") and under Turner's by-line, both of which suggest that the following "press release" was not actually a press release, as that term is commonly understood. The column was published on the Op-Ed page, a page devoted to syndicated, featured, and freelance articles covering a broad spectrum of subjects, rather than among news reports. An unwary reader would be alerted to the sarcastic nature of the "press release" upon reading its opening two words — "Good riddance" — and would certainly be disabused of any lingering tendency to read the column literally upon encountering the contents of the "press release" as it develops. There is surely at least a whiff of the ridiculous about the "press release" which would arouse in the reader "a measure of scepticism

and an expectation of amusement." *Myers, supra* at 342. As with the attributed letter in *Lane, supra* the tongue-in-cheek and sometimes droll quality of Turner's article, emerging from the language, format, and tone he employs, clearly serves to express his *opinion* that the plaintiff himself was responsible for his own perceived poor press relations. In this light, the column could not reasonably be understood to present factually the press release as the plaintiff's own product.[20]

The plaintiff asserts that Turner's reputation as a political writer rather than as a satirist or humorist, considered with the placement of the column on the Op-Ed page rather than on a page devoted to comics or humorous articles, assists in creating a context in which a reader would understand the "press release" to be real. I must disagree. Turner's reputation as a political columnist is not so ironclad as to preclude him professionally from placing his tongue squarely in his cheek on occasion. Although some may quarrel with the effectiveness of his satirical style or with the deftness of his touch, such criticism does not raise actionable claims. *Polygram Records* v. *Superior Court, supra* at 258-259; *Miller* v. *Charlestown Gazette, supra* at 2544-2545. One need not be a humorist, nor have the reputation of a humorist, nor even be particularly amusing, to publish one's opinions in a humorous or satirical form. As to the plaintiff's second contention, perhaps placement of the Turner column on the comics page would have made its satirical nature more obvious. On the other hand, perhaps not. The satire was clear enough on the Op-Ed page.[21]

---

[20] The editorial use of the fictitious press release or letter in a political context is not restricted to Turner. By coincidence, on January 29, 1986, in the publication "News West", the columnist James Kerasiotes authored an imagined letter from "The Dukakis Committee", which is reproduced as Appendix "F". No reasonable reader of News West would consider that the supposed letter was factual.

[21] Even a casual reader of Op-Ed pages notices that writers such as Art Buchwald, Andy Rooney and others well known for their humorous and satirical pieces, have often, if not customarily, been found on those pages.

For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that an ordinary reader must find that the Turner article was an expression of pure opinion. Therefore, the article is not actionable.

8. *The Farrell Articles.*

A. *The November 8, 1981, Farrell Article*[22]

(Counts I and II)

These counts of the Complaint focus on the first paragraph of a column written by defendant Farrell and published by the Globe on November 8, 1981. The article largely concerns political decisions made by the plaintiff regarding liquor legislation and other matters. The article is captioned:

"*Liquor Legislation*
ED KING'S PROMISES
NOT MONEY IN BANK."

Above the caption is a photograph of the plaintiff bearing the caption "Gov. Edward J. King", and to the picture's immediate left a box which reads:

> Fred Martignetti and other proponents of the Primary Source liquor bill now have learned what others before them have discovered to their consternation: that Ed King's promises carry no ironclad guarantees.

Drawing from the Governor's decision-making in these instances, in the last paragraph of the 23-paragraph article, the author critizes him for demonstrating a "condescending attitude [that] never was more in evidence than in October when King called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case." The case is not mentioned in any of the preceding paragraphs.

---

[22] A copy of this column is attached to this Memorandum as Appendix "G".

In the criminal case mentioned by Farrell, five men had pleaded guilty in Norfolk Superior Court to charges of rape, unnatural rape, and malicious destruction of property, and were subsequently sentenced by Associate Justice Herbert B. Abrams of the Superior Court. The Governor took numerous steps to express publicly his disapproval of the sentence imposed, included hosting a talk show during which he expressed his concern with the sentences; holding a press conference at which the matter was discussed; distributing an official statement; releasing a copy to the press of a letter he had written to the Chief Justice of the Superior Court[23] about the matter; announcing his intent to file related sentencing legislation; and releasing a copy of a letter he had written to the Judicial Conduct Commission with respect to Judge Abram's conduct in imposing sentence.

In the pre-trial proceedings Farrell asserts that he was informally told about the alleged call to Judge Abrams by State Treasurer Robert Q. Crane. Crane, when deposed, agreed that he had told Farrell, but had no recollection of his *own* source of the information. The plaintiff denies ever having made the call; and in his deposition Judge Abrams categorically denied having received any such call from the Governor or any one on his behalf. There is no other evidence indicating that the call was ever made.

The challenged final paragraph follows immediately upon a paragraph which states:

> It has taken some political figures a long time to realize that King operates on a one-way street and regards all other state officials — duly elected officers, elected legis-

[23] I was the Chief Justice of the Superior Court at the time of these events. The parties have stipulated that my marginal involvement in the matter is no impediment to my accepting a special assignment in this case; and have specifically agreed that I might sit herein.

> lators, judges and other members of the judiciary — as subordinates of the executive, with their principal function to serve him, the master. (underscoring supplied).

Then follows what Farrell expresses as evidence of such attitude:

> That condescending attitude never was more in evidence than in October when King called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had ordered in a gang-rape case. The judge acquiesced and proved two things: 1) King's original appointment of him was a colossal blunder. 2) He is unfit to remain on the bench.

The very heart of a libel suit is the injury that false words can cause to a person's reputation. A libelous statement consists of "written words which would tend to hold the plaintiff up to scorn, hatred, ridicule, or contempt, in the minds of any considerable and respectable segment in the community." *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, Inc.*, 367 Mass. 849, 853 (1975). That a plaintiff finds a statement unpleasant and offensive is not enough, since defamation necessarily involves the idea of disgrace. Prosser and Keeton, Law of Torts 773 (5th ed. 1985). It is for the court in the first instance to determine whether a statement is capable of a defamatory meaning. Restatement (Second) of Torts § 614 (1977); Prosser and Keeton, Law of Torts 774 (5th ed, 1985). If the words are incapable as a matter of law of a defamatory meaning, the court must dismiss the complaint. See *Borski* v. *Kochanowski,* 3 Mass. App. Ct. 269 (1975). If a publication is susceptible of both defamatory and harmless meanings it presents a question for the jury which of the meanings were so understood. *Smith* v. *Suburban Restaurants, Inc.*, 374 Mass. 528, 530 (1978). Finally, a publisher may be liable for the implications of a par-

ticular statement, and not just for its literal meaning. ("Implication" has been defined by one commentator as the understanding which the average reader may be expected to draw from the face of the communication alone. See Sack, Libel, Slander, and Related Problems § II. 4.3. at 50 [Practicing Law Institute, 1980]).

Placed within the context of the entire article, the statement complained of in Counts I and II functions as a disclosed fact upon which Farrell (in part) based his expressed opinion that the plaintiff demonstrated a "condescending attitude." The Restatement sets forth a fact pattern regarding the expression of opinion which is relevant here: "(1) If the defendant bases his expression of a derogatory opinion of the plaintiff on his own statement of false and derogatory facts, he is subject to liability for the factual statement but not for the expression of opinion." Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566, comment c at 175 (1977). In *Fleming* v. *Benzaquin*, 390 Mass. 175 (1983), the Supreme Judicial Court referred to this example to underscore the requirement that the plantiff prove that the disclosed fact is "both false and defamatory". Even though the fact may be demonstrably false, there can be no liability if the fact is not also defamatory.

The defendants concede for purposes of this motion the falsity of the statement that the plaintiff called and exerted pressure upon Judge Abrams, but maintain that the statement is not defamatory. The plaintiff, on the other hand, maintains that the statement charges him with engaging in "unheard of conduct involving a private communication with a judge by a Governor", Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Fact, p. 152, amounting possibly to violations of law. For the reasons set forth, I conclude that there is no perceptible defamatory aspect in the erroneous statement, and therefore, I grant summary judgment dismissing these counts of the complaint.

Farrell's statement does not charge the plaintiff with the commission of a crime.[24] The general test for libel, however, is much broader than simply whether a crime or wrongdoing has been imputed to the plaintiff. *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers, supra* at 853. To this effect, the plaintiff contends that the defamatory impact of the statement lies in its suggestions that his alleged actions "far exceeded the proper scope of his powers of office and constituted an abuse of his powers and an impermissible interference with the operation of the judicial system." Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Fact, p. 153. The article obviously does not say this explicitly. If such a charge is present, it must be in the form of an implication that an average reader could expectedly draw from the article.

It is a familiar principle of construction that allegedly defamatory words must be given their plain and ordinary meanings in the full context in which they occur. "The meaning of a communication is that which the recipient correctly, or mistakenly but reasonably, understands that it was intended to express." Restatement (Second) of Torts § 563 (1977). Here, the challenged statement was published approximately one month after Judge Abrams' highly publicized sentencing decision. The plaintiff himself stepped to the forefront of the debate surrounding that decision, forcefully identifying himself with those who were critical of the sentence. It is highly unlikely that an average reader, when considering the proprieties of the plaintiff's reported actions, would judiciously distinguish between the numerous, highly visible actions taken by the plaintiff and the single action falsely attributed to him. The defamatory construction the plaintiff puts upon the words is not the construction an average reader would put upon them in the

[24] Obstruction of justice has not been recognized in Massachusetts as a common law crime. See *Commonwealth* v. *Devlin*, 366 Mass. 132, 138 (1974). No allegation of bribery or extortion can be made out on the facts stated by Farrell. Plaintiff's Complaint, pp. 7, 15.

context of both the whole article and the state of public opinion at that time. Moreover, it is no more likely that the reader would regard a governor's call to a judge to complain about an unpopular and controversial decision as reflecting disgrace upon the governor. This seems especially true where, as here, the plaintiff vigorously undertook a public course of action for which such a call would be a logical (if unsuitable) culmination.

Farrell's inaccurate statement, thus viewed, simply cannot be seen as bearing the meaning which the plaintiff sets forth. Even though the statement is accepted as false, it bears an unambiguous meaning which could not expose the plaintiff to the hatred, ridicule, and contempt of the community which is a necessary predicate to a libel action. For this reason alone, the statement is not actionable. Nonetheless, even were I to assume that there is sufficient evidence of the defamatory tendencies of the statement, I would be constrained to dismiss the counts on the other threshold issue of actual malice.

The plaintiff is entitled to establish actual malice (a subjective matter) by reasonable inferences of malice drawn from objective evidence. *Stone* v. *Essex County Newspapers,* 367 Mass. 849, 868 (1975). "A major basis for inferring actual malice involves examination of the sources used by a reporter." *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media,* 390 Mass. 51, 57 (1983). Actual malice may be found where there are obvious reasons to doubt the veracity of the informant or the accuracy of his report. *St. Amant* v. *Thompson,* 390 U.S. 727, 732 (1968). Considering the evidence with an indulgence in this favor, *NAGE* v. *Central Broadcasting Corp.*, 379 Mass. 220, 231 (1979), the plaintiff is entitled to a jury trial if there is some indication from which an inference of actual malice could reasonably be drawn. He maintains that reasonable inferences could be drawn that would (1) establish that no source existed at all for Farrell's statement; and (2) establish alternatively that Farrell's failure to conduct

an investigation of Crane's statement and his "machinations concerning Crane's confidentiality" constitute direct evidence of actual malice. I am unpersuaded that the evidence to which he points creates a triable issue.

First, the evidence underscored by the plaintiff does not support his contention that no source existed for the challenged statement. He refers to various depositional statements in the record to support his theory, but his reading of the statements is, at best, strained.[25] The mere existence of a dispute over material facts to be inferred does not preclude summary judgment. The dispute must be *genuine*, i.e., the inferences adverse to the moving party must be sufficiently plausible that they could reasonably be drawn by a jury. Based upon suspicion and surmise rather than upon hard factual evidence, the inferences asserted here are not sufficiently plausible to create a triable issue.

The plaintiff also argues that a dispute exists as to whether the defendants published the erroneous information supplied by Crane despite serious doubts as to its veracity. The direct evidence of actual malice on this point is Farrell's claimed failure to investigate or verify the statement. It is well settled that a reporter's failure to investigate does not in and of itself establish bad faith. *St. Amant* v. *Thompson, supra* at 733. "As

---

[25] For example, the plaintiff focuses upon Crane's explanation that he delayed identifying himself as the source because he "didn't want to be the source of this" (Crane Deposition, p. 79), as evidence that Crane never was the source. Crane's explanation for at last coming forward ("Mr. Farrell had already listed me as the source . . ") proves, the plaintiff contends, that Crane "had been forced to state he was the source." Plaintiff's Memorandum, p. 191. Similarly, when the plaintiff's counsel confronted Crane at his deposition with the "no source" theory, Crane responded, "I think you're certainly entitled to your opinions." The plaintiff construes this response as a refusal to deny the theory, thereby negatively affirming it. A similar gloss is placed upon Farrell's long acquaintance with Crane, upon Michael Janeway's lack of surprise upon learning that Crane had stepped forth as the source, and upon Farrell's termination of employment.

long as the sources of the libelous information appeared reliable, and the defendant had no doubts about its accuracy, the courts have held the evidence of malice insufficient to support a jury verdict." *Ryan* v. *Brooks*, 634 F.2d 726, 734 (4th Cir. 1980). See *Curran* v. *Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc.*, 432 A.2d 652 (Pa. 1981); *Hall* v. *Rogers*, 390 A.2d 502 (RI 1985). By contrast, where a defendant fails to investigate in the face of affirmative evidence of falsehood and inaccuracy, or knowing of the inherent unreliability of a source, a sufficient showing may be made to reach a jury regarding the defendant's recklessness in publishing the falsehood. Here, Farrell received the information from an individual who was a highly-placed public official, personally acquainted with both Farrell and the plaintiff, and whose past honesty is unquestioned by the parties. Thus, the evidence establishes that Crane was a reliable source of information. The information provided was not "so inherently improbable that only a reckless man would have put [it] in circulation." *St. Amant* at 731. Absent "obvious reasons to doubt the veracity of the informant or the accuracy of the reports," *id.*, it cannot be said that Farrell entertained the requisite doubt central to a finding of reckless disregard of truth or falsity.

Other evidence adduced by the plaintiff from which malice might be inferred does not aid his case. (1) Reasoning from the evidence regarding Merkert Industries[26] to a finding of

[26] Considered in favor of the plaintiff, the evidence shows that Farrell received compensation from Merkert Industries for consulting work or, as characterized by editor Janeway, "public relations work". Viewed as compromising the Globe's and Farrell's journalistic integrity, this outside work resulted in Farrell's discharge from employment with the Globe. Other Globe employees had not been discharged for similar infractions. Notably, Crane sat on the Board of Directors of Merkert Industries and was professionally associated with Mr. Merkert. In this tangled web of professional contacts (more fully set forth in the Plaintiff's Memorandum, pp. 45-55) the plaintiff finds shadowy inferences of actual malice lurking. Discovery is complete, and the details which the plaintiff has carefully combed from the extensive discovery materials still do not bear upon the issue at hand.

actual malice involves a degree of hazy speculation that no longer has a place at this stage of the litigation. (2) Crane's opinion that Farrell "doesn't write anything good about [the plaintiff]" is not evidence of Farrell's actual malice. (3) Farrell's recognition that Crane "makes mistakes occasionally and is not infallible" does not convert Crane into an unreliable source whose statements cannot be published without peril. (4) Farrell's "machinations concerning the alleged existence of confidentiality" do not constitute direct evidence of actual malice, as the plaintiff contends. Indeed, the likelihood (or unlikelihood) that Farrell entertained "serious doubts" as to the truth of Crane's statement does not seem greater, lesser, or at all different in light of such evidence.

B. *The November 22, 1981, Farrell Column*[27]
(Counts III and IV)

On November 22, 1981, the Globe published an article by Farrell about the plaintiff's business relationship with one David R. Thissen. The article is headed:

"*State Politics*
MISSING VIP"

The article deals primarily with David R. Thissen and the plantiff's longtime friendship with him. It is captioned "Missing VIP", referring to Thissen's absence from a fundraising cruise. Thissen's picture appears. The material which the plaintiff asserts is defamatory of him is found in the ninth paragraph, and involves reference to one Edward Keelan, as an example of the plaintiff's "personal loyalty" toward associates, as follows:

---

[27] A copy of this column is attached to this Memorandum as Appendix "H".

> The governor has never run away from Thissen, even in the face of strong recommendations by Hanley et al that he would be better off putting some distance between himself and Thissen. This personal loyalty King manifests towards associates never was more apparent than during the recent in-fighting over a satisfactory racing bill for the industry. Despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners.

The article then reverts to further discussion of Thissen in the remaining nine paragraphs.

In this paragraph midway through the article discussing the plaintiff's "personal loyalty . . . toward [his] associates", Farrell thus stated that the plaintiff as Governor "has made no secret of his efforts to do [dog racing promoter Eddie] Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keeland and his partners." The legislation referred to is a racing bill which passed the Legislature in the Fall of 1981, but which the plaintiff as Governor refused to sign as passed. That bill gave the Raynham dog track additional racing dates which competed with the schedule of the harness track at Foxborough. The plaintiff as Governor predicated his approval upon three amendments, one of which would have aided the track at Foxborough by preserving certain dates free of competition from the nearby Raynham and Taunton tracks.

Both the plaintiff and his wife have had business and social relationships with Keelan dating back through the 1970's; and Keelan had contributed to his gubernatorial campaign. Farrell, on the other hand, is a friend and business associate of one George Carney, a part owner of the race track in Raynham.

Again, it is for the court to determine initially whether an allegedly defamatory statement taken in its natural sense can be understood as stating a fact. *Myers, supra* at 339. Examining the totality of the circumstances is essential to determine whether the reader would have treated the statement as opinion. *Henry* v. *Halliburton,* 690 S.W.2d 775, 788 (Mo. 1985); *Myers, supra* at 342-343. Moreover, what constitutes a statement of fact in one context may be treated as a statement of opinion in another, in light of the nature and content of the communication taken as a whole. *Cole* v. *Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., supra* at 310. With these principles in mind, I conclude that the section of Farrell's article complained of cannot be understood as fact and, indeed, is constitutionally protected as opinion.

The gist of the plaintiff's complaint is that the defendants falsely stated that he, in doing the "bidding" of a business associate regarding the racetrack legislation, was involved in an unlawful conflict of interest. Whether carefully or cursorily read, the article in its relevant aspect concerns the plantiff's "personal loyalty" to associates even when conventional political wisdom (or indeed the public good) would seem to require setting loyalties aside. The implication that the plaintiff was motivated by personal loyalties and perhaps self-interest rather than the public good in pursuing particular legislation is well within the scope of protected expression of speech enjoyed by a free press. It is vital to our form of government that press and citizens alike be free to discuss and, if they see fit, impugn the motives of public officials. *Janklow* v. *Newsweek, Inc.,* — F.2d — (8th Cir. 1986). As I have noted above with regard to the "billboard" editorial, a journalist's commentary on a public official's business, social, or political affiliations and how those affiliations seem reflected in decision-making has a vital place in open public discourse. "[S]hort of accusation of crime or personal dishonesty, the First Amendment protects even sharp attacks on the character, motives, or moral qualifi-

cations of a public officer . . ." *Okun* v. *Superior Court,* 629 P.2d 1369, 1374 (Cal. 1981).

The plaintiff contends, however, that more than his motives in fashioning the racetrack legislation are under Farrell's attack; and that Farrell has taken the extra step of accusing him of specific wrongful conduct, viz., that he received benefits of value in return for carrying out Keelan's bidding. As he correctly states, "Accusations of criminal activity, even in the form of opinion, are not constitutionally protected . . .". *Cianci* v. *New Times Publishing Co.,* 639 F.2d 54, 63 (2d Cir. 1980). The flaw in his argument, however, is the added freight interpolated upon the word "bidding". Would an ordinary reader understand that word in this context to refer to, or imply, the hard fact of a bribe or of extortion or of a corrupt exchange of benefits for value? I think not. The word itself (or, for that matter, the sentence segment "efforts to do Keelan's bidding") is not a direct accusation of unlawful activity. See *Janklow* v. *Newsweek, Inc.,* — F.2d — (8th Cir. 1986). Standing alone, it is too imprecise and colloquial to be considered actionable as a defamation. Furthermore, consideration of its context negatives the meaning the plaintiff would have it carry. In an article partyly about the relationship between public image and personal loyalty, the vague assertion that the plaintiff made efforts to do another's bidding could not reasonably amount to a factual assertion of a crime. See, e.g., *Anton* v. *St. Louis Suburban Newspapers, Inc.,* 598 S.W.2d 493 (Mo. App. 1980) (remark that lawyer engaged in "sleazy dealings" an expression of opinion); *Good Government Group of Seal Beach, Inc.* v. *Superior Court,* 22 Ca.3d 672 (1978) (charging "chicanery and machinations" not actionable, whereas charging extortion of $100,000 by blackmail is actionable); *Henry* v. *Halliburton, supra* (description of public figure as a "fraud" who "fleeced a consumer . . . for personal gain" too broad and unfocused to be an accusation of specific crime). Cf. *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media,* 390 Mass. 51 (1983) (charges that union official has

"family members on the payroll" and that he passed "confidential information to city officials" were statements of fact). The thrust of this second Farrell article is that the plaintiff as Governor was inclined to ignore political liabilities in favor of personal loyalties and *and* that on one occasion he acted unlawfully in observing those loyalties. In light of both the content and context of this alleged defamation, the construction urged is forced and strained. The statement is an opinion fully deserving of constitutional protection.

The plaintiff does not rest here, however, but further argues that Farrell's opinion is actionable because it is based on undisclosed defamatory facts. In this view, Farrell based the statement "King made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding" upon the fact that Keelan was often around the State House and met with the plaintiff on Saturdays. Granting that these facts were undisclosed, and assuming they are false, I do not see how they can be regarded as defamatory. On the other hand, the assertion that the plaintiff and Keelan had a "close association" was based on information publicly available and does not imply undisclosed defamatory facts.

Finally, even if the challenged statements were comprised of factual materials, my careful review of the available evidence satisfies me that the plaintiff would be unable to prove, and has not presently sufficiently demonstrated, that Farrell published these statements with actual malice. Briefly considering the plaintiff's arguments, and bearing in mind the Supreme Court's guidance in *St. Amant* v. *Thompson,* I note the following:

(1) That Farrell wrote that the legislation "would greatly benefit" rather than "would have greatly benefitted" Keelan does not add to the plaintiff's case. The same is true of Farrell's use of the phrase "close association" rather than "business association". In recently considering a similar argument, the Eighth Circuit opined, "[T]he First Amendment cautions courts

against intruding too closely into questions of editorial judgment, such as the choice of specific words. Editors' grilling of reporters on word choice is a necessary aggravation. But when courts do it, there is a chilling effect on the exercise of First Amendment rights." *Janklow* v. *Newswseek, Inc.*, — F.2d —, — (8th Cir. 1986).

(2) Farrell's reliance on Frank Rich, a political adversary of the plaintiff's, does not manifest actual malice since Farrell's statements are based on conversations with numerous individuals. Rich's contribution as a source does not taint Farrell's information or cast doubt upon what he believed to be true.[28]

(3) Evidence suggesting that Farrell was in a certain sense doing Carney's "bidding" is of a highly dubious quality. Likewise, Farrell's own notes reflecting his understanding of who benefitted from the plaintiff's planned racing legislation fall far short of the kind of evidentiary display that would necessitate a jury trial. Evidence in the form of ten-year old barroom political gossip (offered second-hand) and a reporter's hastily scribbled notes is far too insubstantial to educate this court, or any reasonable jury, as to the presence of actual malice on Farrell's part.

For these reasons, summary judgment is in order dismissing these counts of the plaintiff's Complaint.

9. *Conclusion*

(1.) Public officials (particularly *elected* public officials in the highest echelons of government) enjoy many benefits of office. They are clothed with sweeping powers and recognition far beyond the reach of the average citizen. They attract the support, adulation and loyalty of many before, during, and after holding office. But with the benefits of office go its

[28] For this reason, it is unnecessary for this court to inquire whether Rich's "estranged relationship" with his son should have caused Farrell to doubt Rich's information, or whether Farrell had any obligation to investigate the Capitol Police log.

burdens, including the continual interest and unremitting scrutiny of the media. They must expect criticism along with praise. Often that criticism may seem to the elected official to be unwarranted, unpleasant, inaccurate, irrational, illogical, adamantly doctrinaire, and totally incorrect. Often if appears to be — and sometimes is — much more: caustic, arrogant, harsh, acerbic, insulting, intemperate, carping, abusive, persecutive, mean, spiteful, vehement, vindictive, vituperative and oppressive. Often the elected official must withstand a veritable drumbeat of biting criticism by the media of his or her performance in office; and that criticism can be very sharp, stinging and hurtful, not only personally but in particular to the official's family. But, only our system of government and particularly under the precepts of the First Amendment, in the interest of uninhibited, robust, and wide-open debate, the elected public official is expected to able to withstand[29] even the most virulent criticism and complaint, so long as it is made within prescribed constitutional boundaries, i.e. no legal redress by the public official against the publisher for defamation unless the publication is made with "actual malice" — that is, knowing falsity or reckless disregard for truth or falsity. Such is the current state of constitutional law in this area. The rights of a free press, "while lodged in the reporter and his publisher, in reality repeat an underlying interest of the public." *Bruno & Stillman, Inc.* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 633 F.2d 583, 595 n.12 (1st Cir. 1980). The First Amendment, as currently interpreted, requires that "we protect some falsehood in order to protect speech that matters". *Gertz* v. *Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 341 (1974). "When the speech is of public concern and the plantiff is a public official, the Constitution clearly requires

---

[29] Harry S. Truman, perhaps, best epitomized the remedy for the super-sensitive in politics, "If you can't stand the heat, don't go in the kitchen" (as quoted in *Silsdorf* v. *Levine*, 447 NYS 2d 936, 939 [1982]).

the plaintiff to surmount a much higher barrier before recovering damages from a media defendant than is raised by the common law." *Phildelphia Newspapers, Inc.* v. *Hepps*, — U.S. — (Slip opinion, April 21, 1986).

Thus, no matter how much a motion judge may empathize[26] with one who is the target of a fusillade of critical comments, editorials, and cartoons which no doubt appear to such a sensitive public official to be one-sided, mean-spirited and excessive, nevertheless, in the final analysis, the overall public interest in the protection of a vibrant and free press (granting its occasional excesses) mandates that the public official's libel claims be examined with the extreme judicial circumspection. Relief may be accorded to such a public official only if that person clearly comes within the narrow boundaries limned by *Times* v. *Sullivan* and its progeny. In my considered opinion none of the plaintiff's claims here meets that stringent test, under currently declared constitutional principles. It follows that the several defendants are entitled to summary judgment.

(2.) A summary judgment shall enter forthwith DISMISSING each of the twelve counts of the plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

So ordered.

James P. Lynch, Jr.
Justice of the Superior Court

Dated: April 30, 1986

[26] Judges, as well as other officials, are from time to time the recipients of what they consider to be grossly unfair treatment in the media. While the public official, by virtue of his or her public position, usually has a forum to counter-attack, by contrast the judge under media attack is constrained to suffer in silence.

Appendix "A"

COMMMONWEALTH OF MASSSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss. SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL ACTION
No. 52488

EDWARD J. KING

vs.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY & others

DEPOSITIONS

DATE FILED IN COURT	NAME OF DEPONENT	VOLUMES
May 24, 1982	Francis P. Rich	1 Volume
July 28, 1982	Robert L. Turner	2 Volumes
August 12, 1982	David J. Farrell	4 Volumes
January 17, 1984		
August 13, 1982	Paul Szep	1 Volume
August 13, 1982	Michael Kenney	1 Volume
August 13, 1982	Anne Wyman	1 Volume
November 30, 1982	Philip J. Aube	1 Volume
July 16, 1984	Edward J. Keelan	1 Volume
December 10, 1985	David J. Farrell	4 Volumes
January 17, 1986		
December 17, 1985	Robert Q. Crane	1 Volume
December 27, 1985	Robert E. Hughes	1 Volume
January 1, 1986	Herbert Abrams	1 Volume
January 13, 1986	Ben Bradlee	1 Volume

January 14, 1986	Edward J. King	4 Volumes
January 17, 1986		
February 25, 1986	Kathryn Tolbert Dohner	1 Volume
February 27, 1986	Martin Nolan	1 Volume
March 7, 1986	George L. Carney	2 Volumes
March 18, 1986	Edward J. Hanley	1 Volume
March 28, 1986	Ronald Brinn	1 Volume

Appendix B.

". . . the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Guptill, the appointment and forced resignation of Stephen Clifford, the apointment and forced resignation of Thomas DiSilva, the appointment and forced resignation of John Haggerty, the appointment and forced resignation of Barry Locke . . ."

Appendix C.

"SO LET US PREY."

Appendix D.

The old billboard game

Sooner or later, there just had to be the sniff of a billboard scandal. And now there is one and it brings back those good old days when the lobbyist was king and there were always goodies for his pals in the Legislature.

During 10 years that may someday be labeled Massachusetts' "good government decade," the billboard industry has been on the run. Local communities that decided they'd been captive long enough to 672 square-foot huckstering found that state agencies and the courts were backing them up when they moved to get offending signs removed. Some legislators even discovered they could get along without a free lunch or a free billboard just before election time.

It was not that the billboard industry had folded up its barker's stand; it fought every attempt to regulate its excesses and spent a lot of money on lawyers and lobbyists. Yet, while there are still some 1000 billboards standing in violation of local, state, or federal regulations, they have been coming down from the places where people did not want them.

But now, in the space of barely a year, the tide has turned — not because people and local officials got up and objected, demanding that the billboards be put back up, but apparently, as The Globe's Spotlight Team has detailed, because industry money finally reached what must be the right places.

One year ago last August the locally-owned Donnelly Advertising Co., the state's major billboard advertising firm, was bought out for $9 million by Ackerley Communications, one of the nation's largest billboard firms. Ackerley signed up former House Speaker Robert H. Quinn to do its lobbying at the State House. Then, just before the September primary,

seven of its executives (and their friends and relatives) discovered Edward J. King, at the time just an underdog candidate for governor, and dropped $7000 into his campaign treasury.

And back out of the Beacon Hill closet come all the old games. A bill zips through the Legislature and into law with King's signature to allow a ski resort billboard to remain despite a court order. King's transportation secretary and close adviser Barry Locke moves to block the removal of 95 billboards that violate the federal highway beautification law. And to top it off — for now, anyway — the administration starts talking about weakening the powers of the watchdog Outdoor Advertising Board.

Meanwhile, the industry is apparently posting or enlarging signs without permits, and providing free billboard space — either knowingly or by a very expensive oversight — to Boston mayoral candidate David Finnegan who just happens to be brother of the House Ways and Means chairman.

And why? Because billboard advertising is a big bucks industry but, curiously, an industry with not much of a constituency and, despite the piteous claims of its State House supporters, with no more than 400 employees at present, according to an industry source.

Those factors prompted the billboard industry to act as it did in the past and the way it apparently will continue to operate until it can be compelled to obey the wishes of local communities and the standards set by local, state, and federal regulations. It will be a hard game to win in a tough league, but the victory will be worth it.

Appendix D.

"ACKERLEY BILLBOARDS CAN PUT MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS TOO!"
ACKERLEY

Appendix E.

There's a new 'can-do' man in charge

NEWS RELEASE
To: The State House press
Date: Jan. 9, 1980
From: Gov. Edward J. King
Contact: Gov. Edward J. King

Following is a statement from Gov. Edward J. King on the departure of his press secretary, Ronald C. Brinn.

"Good riddance.

"With Ron Brinn out of the administration, the big roadblock is removed. Now I'll be able to get my message out to the people and pal around with reporters the way I tried to all last year. But Ron kept getting in the way.

"Clearly, I could have made the $500 million property tax rollback if Ron had only performed up to par. And talk about patronage! Ron was the one who insisted that I hire Guptill and Clifford and Haggerty and DiSilva and Foster. And now the MBTA's a big headache and Ron's no help — he's a Navy man.

"Ron, in fact, was the hard-boiled grinch who told me to cut off funds to the Pine Street Inn a week before Christmas.

"Clearly, we don't have to look very far to find out why my ratings have been plummeting in the polls. The substance has been terrific; Ron just didn't communicate the image.

"And let's not have any more talk about poor communication between Ron and me, either. It was Ron who insisted last spring that he move his offices down to the nether reaches of the State House — about three bus stops and an elevator ride from me. Ron felt he had been getting too close.

"If Ron wasn't well informed about administration activities, it's not my fault. I told him to read the papers. Somebody in this administration ought to read the papers.

"While we're on bad communications, let's get one thing straight. For all his faults, I didn't fire Ron, or even 'displace' him, as he said. I offered him a perfectly good job handing out press releases in the Saltonstall Building someplace.

"All these months, I've been dying to get friendly with the press, but Ron kept shouldering me aside, wanting the spotlight for himself.

"And people got the wrong idea. When Ron jumped out there to deal with the Guptill and Clifford firings and to face the demonstration of shouting welfare mothers, people thought I was cowering in my office and had fed Ron to the wolves. Actually I was champing at the bit to demonstrate my 'can-do' approach to problem-solving.

"For the sake of accuracy, I must reveal this: Ron is the one with the taste for lobster salad — and tail meat only, please. The Globe smeared me terribly with that picture of a nice, big lobster on Page One. I wanted to talk to the public, to tell the taxpayers the truth — that when they paid $260 for dinner for me and a trooper and Tommy McGee and his wife and his son, it wasn't lobster at all. It was only cold cuts that cost $52 per person.

"I should have learned my lesson early. Marty Burke, my press secretary during the campaign, seemed to be working out until he actually started talking to reporters. Naturally, I had to get rid of him. I tried to set both Marty and Ron straight by embarrassing them in public, but it didn't work.

"Ron turned out to be a big mistake. When I brought him over from MassPort, the most he'd ever done was coordinate press activities at Logan Airport when a DC-9 smashed into the sea wall there. He'd never worked a real disaster.

"Now things will be different. From now on, Ed King will have the best PR man in the business: Ed King."

For a recorded actuality of Gov. Edward J. King reading this press release, call "Dial-a-Governor" — 1-800-632-8222.

Robert L. Turner is a Globe political columnist.

Appendix F.

Kindly disregard our last letter

Former Governor Edward King's announcement that he would not run again in 1986 was front page news last Friday. Just moments after reading one newspaper's account of King's press conference I began looking through the stack of morning mail. On top, was a fundraising letter from the Dukakis committee. The letter, signed by Senator Edward Kennedy, made a strong appeal for financial support to defeat the massively financial radical right-wing and its candidate for Governor, Ed King. Below is the text of a letter I expect will be showing up in my mailbox any time now.

FROM: THE DUKAKIS COMMITTEE
TO: JAMES KERASIOTES

Dear James:

Last Friday you received a copy of the Massachusetts Success Story — which demonstrates the achievements of Mike Dukakis since his return to the State House in 1982. This is the third copy (and the third fund-raising solicitation) we've sent you this year. Our records do not indicate a reply from you, but never mind that for now.

Frankly, we'd like to apologize. First, we spelled your name wrong: a computer error which we assure you will never happen again. Then, Senator Ted Kennedy wasted four pages, and your valuable time, to explain that Ed King, with the backing of far right activists like Ronald Reagan and the John Birch Society, will spend twice as much to defeat Mike Dukakis in 1986 at he did in 1978.

How embarrasing! We paid the freight for Ted Kennedy to put a little scare into you, and hopefully loosen up your pocketbook on the same day Ed King said he would not run.

The Committee has to take full responsibility for this error. We knew that Ed King wasn't going to run. Just ask anybody over at the *Globe*. For months we've been telling them he wouldn't run.

Maybe we let Senator Kennedy go a little too far to settle an old dispute with King. In 1980 Ed King, the Democratic Governor of Massachusetts, appeared in TV commercials around the country endorsing incumbent President Jimmy Carter's campaign against Ted Kennedy's insurgent challenge. This hurt Kennedy, and he must still be feeling the pain.

Nevertheless, it is now clear to all that there will be no contest for Governor in 1986. With Ed King out, and only a few "nay-sayers" to offer up some self-serving but groundless noise, we fully expect Governor Dukakis to win by acclamation this year.

Therefore, the committee, at the request of the Governor, has decided to discontinue its fundraising efforts. Further, the Governor has insisted that all unspent campaign funds be returned, pro-rata, to his financial supporters.

Please rest assured that should the need arise to solicit you again later this year, we will be sure to frame our appeal on the Governor's many accomplishments, such as roadblocks, and the mandatory seat belt law: not by drumming up some bogey man non-candidate like Ed King.

Again, we apologize for our letter of last week and ask that you kindly disregard it.

Sincerely,
The Dukakis Committee

Appendix G.

Ed King's promises not money in bank

David Farrell

After the controversial Primary Source liquor bill squeaked through the House and Senate at the end of October, chain store owner Freddy Martignetti breathed a sigh of relief. All that he needed was the signature of Gov. Edward J. King.

Martignetti and the governor had discussed the bill and Martignetti's industry problems on several occasions during recent years. And he had King's word that he would sign the measure. That was like having money in the bank.

Martignetti and King had been good friends since their BC High days when Freddy and twin brother Joe met King. The Freddy Martignettis and the Kings socialized over the years, at house parties and other get-togethers. The athletic prowess of the Martignetti children was another bond with the governor, who is well known for his partiality to and idolization of athletes. Most recently, King and Freddy spent considerable time together at the wedding and reception for one of the Martignetti children several weeks ago.

Now for the first time in seven years, Freddy Martignetti could see some daylight in his long battle with the State Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission (ABCC) and the courts over the number of package stores he may legally operate.

Bill's opponents knew their man

The 56-year-old Martignetti knew that the commission decisions which mandated him to get rid of some of his stores because he violated the spirit of the three-store statute would stand, no matter what happened to the Primary Source bill.

But enactment and signing of the measure, whose main provision would bar retail outlets from dealing with out-of-state wholesalers, also would mean that the three-license limit would be scrapped and raised to a seven-license plateau. Martignetti thus would be able to reshuffle his empire and get his business back to the successful peak it enjoyed before the ABCC moved against him.

But while Martignetti, Bruce Wright, Sam Stone and other proponents of Primary Source were laboring so diligently to get the legislation through the House and Senate, opponents, led by Whitehall's Marvin Gordon, came up with a clever strategy that would have appeal only to a governor of King's peculiar makeup.

King was being pressured by public interest groups and some of his own advisers to sign the bottle bill that was so strongly opposed by all liquor interests, Martignetti included, on both sides of the Primary Source controversy. To make it appear that he was seriously weighing the merits of the bottle bill, King even went to Michigan to review that state's excellent experience with its bottle law.

Since Primary Source had been painted by its opponents as an anti-consumer bill which would hike the price of liquor in Massachusetts and send consumers here to New Hampshire liquor stores, why not blunt the anticipated consumer outrage over a bottle bill veto with a veto of Primary Source? King was asked.

The governor, who had teased the public all summer with his well-orchestrated charade about "rethinking" his previous stand against the bottle bill, jumped at the inviting prospect of mitigating the public outcry against his rejection of the anti-litter legislation with his pitch to the consumer on Primary Source.

It didn't matter to King that the liquor legislation was fashioned by his own special commission and tailored pre-

cisely along lines dictated by him. That panel, headed by King's ABCC chairman, John Larkin, labored for months to produce the bill for King.

So it was on the eve of Halloween when Freddy Martignetti learned that Ed King, his pal, planned to veto Primary Source.

"I'm sick. I can't believe it," a stunned Martignetti told everyone he ran into during the next 48 hours.

He couldn't believe that his longtime friend could welch on the commitment and go back on his word. Sure, he had heard some of the many stories about King's unreliability, but he either didn't believe them or didn't want to, on the assumption that his bond with "Eddie" transcended any possibility of a run-out by the governor.

At least he isn't alone

When Martignetti finally got in to see King last Wednesday to discuss the matter, the answer was the same. King tried to soften the blow by suggesting that he could send a special message to take care of Martignetti's package store problem, but Martignetti wasn't taken in, knowing there was no chance such a proposal could survive by itself.

Thus does Martignetti join a growing list of people, many of them former friends of the governor, who have been duped by the chief executive. The list of Walter Hurleys, Paul Heffernans et al is too long to detail in this space. Frank Rich, who grew up with the governor in East Boston, is the most notable of the group. He got burned so often by King's failure to keep his word and commitments that he decided to run against him.

King's next walkout will embrace Quincy Mayor Arthur Tobin, a former state senator who had expected to be appointed clerk/magistrate of Quincy District Court.

When former clerk Dinny Ryan died earlier this year, King confided in intermediaries that Tobin was in the

driver's seat for the position. So certain was Tobin of that commitment that he did not seek re-election last week.

But now King has had his faithful servants on his Judicial Nominating Committee come up with another candidate — this one an assistant court clerk in Plymouth County — and Tobin will be sacrificed. The upcoming bypass of Tobin has worsened the governor's already poor relations in the Senate where Tobin was a popular member. And it has relegated Senate President William M. Bulger's break with King to point-of-no-return status.

Intermediaries have been trying to heal the chasm between Bulger and King, but to no avail. Now their differences are irreconcilable.

In his dealings with the Senate leader, with House Speaker Thomas W. McGee and virtually everyone else in state government, King has demonstrated an attitude which demands total obeisance in exchange for whatever patronage crumbs the governor sees fit to dispense.

It has taken some political figures a long time to realize that King operates on a one-way street and regards all other state officials — duly elected constitutional officers, elected legislators, judges and other members of the judiciary — as subordinates of the executive, with their principal function to serve him, the master.

That condescending attitude never was more in evidence than in October when King called a judge and demanded that he change a decision he had rendered in a gang-rape case. The judge acquiesced and proved two things: 1.) King's original appointment of him was a colossal blunder. 2.) He is unfit to remain on the bench.

David Farrell is a Globe political columnist.

Appendix H.

MISSING VIP

David Farrell

When the S.S. Volendam sailed from Commonwealth Pier on Gov. Edward J. King's "Cruise To Nowhere" fundraiser a fortnight ago, there was one VIP missing from the passenger list. David R. (Dick) Thissen, controversial head of the Desmond & Lord architectural firm, which ran aground during a long investigation by the Special Commission on State and County Buildings last year, passed up the opportunity to spend the night in Massachusetts Bay with King, his longtime friend, business partner and vacation companion.

Under normal conditions, Thissen would have been aboard the liner during the all-night bash, which cost contributors to the governor's re-election campaign $200.

But these are not usual times for Thissen, whose hard-pressed firm merged with John Carl Warnecke & Associates two years ago when it became apparent that the probe of Desmond & Lord by the Ward commission was having a devastating effect on D & L's ability to attract new architectural business in this area. Thissen and the new firm's owner, John Carl Warnecke, have collaborated on several architectural jobs awarded Thissen's old firm during the past two decades.

The personable Thissen, once highly visible, has become a political recluse of sorts and is avoiding the spotlight as much as possible. He still swims at the University Club but is seldom seen at many of the haunts he used to frequent.

It wasn't long ago that he and the governor dined on a regular basis at various restaurants in the metropolitan area.

But all that has changed because of the adverse impact the Ward commission notoriety has had on Thissen ability's [sic] to generate business for the Warnecke firm.

Except for an occasional fundraiser or wedding reception, the two friends rarely get together, as they once did, at such popular restaurants as Anthony's Pier 4 and Jimmy's Harborside. The last time this occurred was about 10 weeks ago when Secretary of Administration and Finance Edward Hanley invited Thissen to the wedding reception for one of his daughters at Pier 4. That, in itself, was surprising since Hanley has never associated with or been an admirer of Thissen. Hanley privately places much of the blame for the deterioration of King's public image on Thissen.

The governor has never run away from Thissen, even in the face of strong recommendations by Hanley et al that he would be better off putting some distance between himself and Thissen. This personal loyalty King manifests towards associates never was more apparent than during the recent in-fighting over a satisfactory racing bill for the industry. Despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners.

King still slips out of town with Thissen. They went to Saratoga for the races last August as they do every summer. Over the Easter holidays last spring, they were at the races in Florida. And this Christmas, as they do every Christmas, they are expected to be together in Miami for the winter racing season.

Thissen's pass-up of King's invitation to join him at the Miami Dolphins-Patriots football game here two Sundays ago is indicative of Thissen's plan to make himself more scarce as the 1982 gubernatorial campaign builds.

He is a very close friend and golfing partner of US House Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill Jr., a fact which puts him in an embarrassing middle as the upcoming battle by Lt. Gov. Thomas P. O'Neill 3d to wrest the governorship from King intensifies. Over the three decades since the elder O'Neill was speaker of the Massachusetts House, Thissen has been an intimate.

What makes the situation difficult for Thissen is that O'Neill's son, the lieutenant governor, has been attacking King (and former Gov. Michael S. Dukakis) with increasing tempo of late. As a result, Thissen, who has been a most generous campaign donor to the governor and both O'Neills, will have to sit out the 1982 battle and content himself with giving them equal contributions.

Dukakis, meanwhile, is planning to make the close relationship between King and Thissen part of his own campaign for another term. The ex-governor's campaign strategists are also assuming that the Thissen association with the O'Neill family will not be overlooked by the electorate.

Dukakis is expected to focus on the King-Thissen links, particularly their efforts to undermine and thwart the work of the Ward commission in 1979 and 1980.

Thissen and King still maintain close busines relationships. They are in the coal business with Red Sox players Carl Yastrzemski and Dwight Evans. The four have invested some $300,000, according to Yastrzemski, in a West Virginia coal mine which has not done well. They recently replaced the general manager of coal operations in an effort to get more production and profits.

On the side, Thissen, who always has had a sharp eye for good investments, continues to develop other relationships with men such as Bruins' president Paul Mooney.

Still unresolved and ahead of him is the allegation by the Ward commission that his former firm illegally contributed $1100 to Gov. King's 1978 campaign through a Desmond & Lord secretary. The commission referred that matter to Atty. Gen. Francis X. Bellotti, who is expected to make a decision on it soon.

David Farrell is a Globe political columnist.

Appendix C.

GOLDMAN & CURTIS
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW
EST. 1913
FOURTH FLOOR, LOWELL PLACE
144 MERRIMACK STREET
LOWELL, MASSACHUSETTS 01852

September 14, 1987
BY HAND

The Honorable Edward F. Hennessey
Chief Justice
Supreme Judicial Court
New Court House
Pemberton Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Re: Edward J. King v.
The Globe Newspaper Company
& others - SJC No. 4296

Dear Mr. Chief Justice:

Plaintiff-Appellant (hereinafter "Plaintiff") petitions for rehearing of the above-referenced case pursuant to Massachusetts Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 27. Specifically, Plaintiff requests rehearing with regard to the Court's ruling on Counts 3 and 4 — David Farrell's November 22, 1981 article and on Counts 7 and 8, Paul Szep's statement appearing in the context of a cartoon that "ACKERLEY BILLBOARDS CAN PUT MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS TOO!" and the billboard editorial, which rulings resulted in the affirming of the Superior Court's granting of summary judgment against Plaintiff.[1]

[1] Plaintiff does not waive any arguments it may have as to the Court's rulings on these or the remaining Counts in which it affirmed the Superior Court's imposition of Summary Judgment.

In its analysis of Counts 3 and 4, Plaintiff respectfully submits that this Court overlooked Defendant Farrell's specific waiver of his First Amendment protection accorded statements of opinion. Libel defendants can waive the constitutional protection afforded purported statements of opinion by admitting a specific intent that the statement constitute a statement of fact, because said protection is for the benefit of the libel defendant. *Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 340 (1974). *See Restatement (Appendix) Torts*, Sec. 566 (Comment c (1982) ("The [d]etermination [as to fact or opinion] depends upon the context and circumstances surrounding the publication and indicating whether the term is *intended* literally or not and upon the precision or imprecision of the meaning for the expression") (emphasis added). The First Amendment's protection against liability for statements arguably resembling an opinion, can be waived, similar to those protections afforded by other constitutional provisions such as the Fourth Amendment's protection against wrongful search and seizures, the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination, and the Eleventh Amendment's protection of States' sovereign immunity.

In addition to the protections afforded by the United States Constitution, many protections accorded by the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights can be waived. Such protections include Article Eleven's protection against an untimely trial, Article Twelve's protection against self-incrimination, against prosecution without the aid of counsel, and protection against having to be tried in a forum not composed of ones peers, Article Fourteen's protection from unreasonable search and seizure, and Article Fifteen's protection affording a right to jury trial.

Article Sixteen's right of free speech, similar to the other rights afforded by Articles Eleven, Twelve, Fourteen and Fifteen, can also be waived.

Mr. Farrell testified that when he wrote "despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie

Keelan, King made no secret of his effort to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation," he intended these words to constitute *statements of fact*. (Appendix I at 323-324).[2] An admission as to a libel defendant's state of mind or intent when writing an allegedly defamatory statement constitutes a *binding* admission. *See* Liacos, *Handbook of Massachusetts Evidence*, 129-130 (5th Ed. 1981). Mr. Farrell's admission that he intended the statement as fact constitutes a binding admission which clearly and effectively waives the applicability of the constitutional protection for "opinion."

So far as we have been able to ascertain there is no reported higher Court decision to the contrary on this *waiver* issue.

Further, the Court held that "Reasonably interpreted, the statement may assert that the position that plaintiff took on that legislation was motivated by loyalty to Keelan, *and perhaps by self-interest*, rather than by concern for the public good." 400 Mass. 705, 716 (1987) (emphasis added). As the Court in *Lyons* v. *New Mass Media, Inc.*, 390 Mass. 51, 59 (1983) stated:

> "Where, . . . however, the allegedly libelous remarks could have been understood by the average reader *in either sense* [— fact or opinion —], the issue *must* be left to the jury's determination."
> (Quotations omitted) (emphasis added).

The article, as the Court correctly analyzed, could reasonably be interpreted to state that Plaintiff enacted legislation on the basis of self-interest. Mr. Farrell's admission of his intent that the words "close association" refer to a "business association" with the Plaintiff taken with his statement that the legislation "would greatly benefit the harness track owned by Keelan *and*

---

[2] Appendix hereinafter referred to as "App."

his partners" implies undisclosed defamatory false "facts" that Plaintiff had an interest in the legislation he enacted, benefited financially from his actions, and therefore "acted pursuant to a corrupt scheme to obtain personal benefits in exchange for political favors." (Opinion, p. 14) They were facts not opinions that Farrell set forth, waiving any constitutional protection. (App. I at 280-281, 323-324).

In light of Mr. Farrell's waiver of his opinion protections and the existence of undisclosed false defamatory facts, Plaintiff respectfully submits that this Court erroneously affirmed the Superior Court's imposition of Summary Judgment in Counts 3 and 4.

Counts 7 and 8 arose out of Paul Szep's October 18, 1979 statement that "ACKERLEY BILLBOARDS CAN PUT MONEY IN YOUR POCKETS TOO!" and an editorial appearing on the same page entitled "The old billboard game." Respectfully, Plaintiff submits that this Court erred in focusing not on whether Defendants carried their burden on Summary Judgment by proving that the same people who read the statement and article also read the report published the previous day, but rather on the fact that Plaintiff allegedly chose not to challenge the accuracy of the previous day's report.

"Inferences to be drawn from the underlying facts contained in [materials submitted on summary judgment motions] must be viewed [by the court] in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion." *Attorney General v. Bailey*, 386 Mass. 367, 371 (1982). All doubts as to the existence of a genuine issue of material fact must be resolved against the proponent of the motion. *Id.* Defendants, *who bear the burden*, submitted no evidence that even a single person who read Mr. Szep's statement or the billboard editorial actually saw, never mind read, the article appearing in the previous day's paper. Moreover, no evidence exists on the record indicating that even one person in the general public *was aware* of the story

in the previous day's paper. Defendants failed to show a commonality in the audience which read the previous day's paper and Szep's statement or the billboard editorial contained in the subsequent day's paper.

Restatement (Second) Torts, Sec. 563 Comment d. recognized that members of the public do not read every article, report and column contained in every newspaper. The American Law Institute observed that ". . . [t]he public frequently reads only the headlines of a newspaper or reads the article itself as hastily or imperfectly as not to realize its full significance." *Id.* Former *Globe* Editor Ann Wyman conceded that every reader does not read the *Globe* every day and that while *she probably had not read the entire article appearing in the previous paper,* she assumed that she read its headline. (App. III at 1007). Mr. Szep couldn't state that he actually read the entire article appearing in the previous day's paper. (App. II at 719-720, 722). *See* Nolan, J., dissenting, 400 Mass. at 736. These statements indicate the *Globe's* awareness of the lack of commonality among its audience on any given two days.

Hypothetically, a 1987 reference to a defamatory "fact" contained in a report published in a 1970 edition of a newspaper would protect a statement from becoming an unprotected statement of opinion based on undisclosed defamatory facts, because no need for a commonality of audience exists. Thus, the Court's holding that mere reference to a previous article appearing in an earlier newspaper constitutes a "disclosure" of underlying defamatory facts in effect creates a license to libel.

Moreover, the Court's repeated apparent reliance on Plaintiff's election not to challenge the "facts" set forth in the article contained in the previous paper, Plaintiff respectfully submits, is misplaced. Unlike the prior article, the editorial incorrectly asserts that a correlation existed between the alleged Ackerley monies and a bill relating to a ski resort "billboard" (actually

a privately owned sign not related to Ackerley or the billboard industry in any way). (Compare Exhibit 2, Tab 4 and Tab 7). Mr. Szep's statement in the cartoon in its context states that the monies Plaintiff received were much more than contributions. The very fact that Mr. Szep depicted the Secretary of Transportation, who had no campaign fund, holding bags of cash buttresses this conclusion. The statement and depiction imply undisclosed false defamatory facts — "facts" not set forth or supported in the prior day's news article.

As recognized by Justice Nolan, 400 Mass. at 735-736, a jury question exists as to whether Szep's statement is susceptible of being read by an *average* reader as either a factual statement or opinion. An average reader could have interpreted the statement as stating that Plaintiff accepted cash bribes in exchange for taking actions favorable to Ackerley Communications and to the billboard industry. The use of the word "pockets" together with the bags of cash in the hands of the Governor and the Secretary of Transportation (who had no campaign fund to accept contributions) could lead the average reader to concluded that a bribe occurred. The word "Too" further indicates that Ackerley had already put money into the "pockets" of both Plaintiff and the Secretary of Transportation. Since, as Justice Nolan astutely observed, the average reader could have interpreted Szep's statement as charging a serious crime, it is for the jury to determine whether the cartoon was in fact defamatory. 400 Mass. at 736 (Nolan, J., dissenting).

On the basis of the foregoing, Plaintiff requests rehearing with respect to the Court's affirming the Superior Court's imposition of summary judgment on Counts 3 and 4 and 7 and 8 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Robert H. Goldman
Robert H. Goldman

/s/ Alan M. Cohen
Alan M. Cohen

cc. Joseph L. Kocuibes, Esq.

Appendix D.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT FOR THE COMMONWEALTH,
AT BOSTON, October 28, 1987

IN THE CASE NO. SJC-4296

EDWARD J. KING

vs.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY & others

pending in the Superior

Court for the County of Suffolk No. 52488

ORDER

It is hereby Ordered, that the Petitions for Rehearing be, and hereby are, denied.

It is further ORDERED that the Motion to Stay Issuance of Rescript is denied.

By the COURT,
/s/Jean M. Kennett, CLERK.

October 28, 1987

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 25 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL
CLERK

No. 87-1259

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1987

EDWARD J. KING,
PETITIONER,

v.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
DAVID FARRELL, AND PAUL SZEP,
RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Response to Edward J. King's Petition for Writ of Certiorari

JOSEPH L. KOCIUBES,*
ROBIN A. DRISKEL,
DON E. GORTON, III,
BINGHAM, DANA & GOULD,
100 Federal Street,
Boston, Massachusetts 02110.
(617) 348-8000

*Counsel of Record

BATEMAN & SLADE, INC. BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Table of Contents

Statement of the Case 2

A. The November 22, 1981 Column 2

B. The "Billboard" Editorial and Cartoon 5

Reasons the Issues Raised by the Governor Need Not Be Reviewed by This Court 6

I. Petitioner Presents No Substantial Federal Questions Requiring Review of the SJC's Decision on the November 22, 1981 Column 7

A. There Was No Waiver of the Protection for Opinion 7

B. The SJC's Interpretation of the Article at Issue Does Not Raise Any Issue Requiring Review by This Court 9

II. The SJC's Decision on the Billboard Editorial and Cartoon Does Not Raise an Issue Worthy of Certiorari 10

Conclusion 13

Table of Authorities Cited

CASES

Aldoupolis v. Globe Newspaper Co., 398 Mass. 731, 500 N.E.2d 794 (1986) 11, 12

Avins v. White, 627 F.2d 637 (3d Cir. 1980) 10

Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., 466 U.S. 485 (1984) 7n

Cafeteria Employees Local 302 v. Angelos, 320 U.S. 293 (1943) 7n

Cianci v. New Times Publishing Co., 639 F.2d 54 (2d Cir. 1980) 12n

Flotech, Inc. v. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 814 F.2d 775 (1st Cir. 1987) 10n

Greenbelt Cooperative Publishing Association v. Bresler, 398 U.S. 6 (1970) 7n

Janklow v. Newsweek, Inc., 788 F.2d 1300 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 107 S.Ct. 272 (1986) 11n

Keller v. Miami Herald Publishing Co., 778 F.2d 711 (11th Cir. 1985) 11

Loeb v. Globe Newspaper Co., 489 F.Supp. 481 (D. Mass. 1980) 12n

Miskovsky v. Tulsa Tribune Co., 678 P.2d 242 (Okla. 1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1006 (1984) 12n

Myers v. Boston Magazine Co., Inc., 380 Mass. 336, 403 N.E.2d 376 (1980) 11n

National Association of Letter Carriers v. Austin, 418 U.S. 264 (1974) 7n

New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254 (1964) 2

NLRB v. Hendricks County Rural Electric Corp., 454 U.S. 170 (1981) 9

Ollman v. Evans, 750 F.2d 970 (D.C. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 471 U.S. 1127 (1985) 11n, 12

Opinion of the Justices, 99 Mass. 636 (1868) 6n

Pritsker v. Brudnoy, 389 Mass. 776, 452 N.E.2d 227 (1983) 10, 11

Rudolph v. United States, 370 U.S. 269 (1962) 10

Sharratt v. Housing Innovations, Inc., 365 Mass. 141, 310 N.E.2d 343 (1974) 9

Smith v. Suburban Restaurants, Inc., 374 Mass. 528, 373 N.E.2d 215 (1978) 9

Tobin v. Boston Herald-Traveler Corp., 324 Mass. 478, 87 N.E.2d 116 (1949) 9

United States v. Lane Motor Co., 344 U.S. 630 (1953) 13n

Wecht v. PG Publishing Co., 510 A.2d 769 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1986) 12n

Yorty v. Chandler, 13 Cal.App.3d 467, 91 Cal.Rptr. 709 (1970) 12n

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND RULES

United States Constitution

First Amendment 7

Massachusetts Constitution

Part II, Ch. I, § 1, Art. II 6n

Supreme Court Rules

Rule 23.1 2, 13n

Rule 28.1 1n

MISCELLANEOUS

Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 (1977) 10, 11

No. 87-1259

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1987

EDWARD J. KING,
PETITIONER,

v.

GLOBE NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
DAVID FARRELL, AND PAUL SZEP,
RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Response to Edward J. King's Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Before announcing for re-election, Edward J. King, then Governor of Massachusetts, sued the Globe Newspaper Co. (the "Globe")[1] as a result of three cartoons, one satire, one

[1] The Globe Newspaper Company publishes *The Boston Globe* and *The Boston Sunday Globe*. It is a subsidiary of Affiliated Publications, Inc. The individual defendants were editorial cartoonist Paul Szep and columnists Robert L. Turner and David Farrell. Plaintiff Edward J. King was elected Governor in 1978 and served from 1979 through 1983. Sup. Ct. Rule 28.1.

editorial and two columns which were published during the course of his term.[2] The Supreme Judicial Court ("SJC") affirmed the entry of summary judgment as to six of the pieces, but reversed on the seventh. The SJC held that actual malice could be found despite the existence of a source (the State Treasurer) with a reputation for veracity.

On November 2, 1987, the Globe and David Farrell petitioned this Court for a writ of certiorari seeking review of the opinion of the SJC because the SJC effectively undermined *New York Times* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964), by holding that actual malice could be found despite a source whose "veracity and accuracy" the journalist had no reason to doubt. The Governor opposed the Globe's petition on or about December 17, 1987. On January 26, 1988, the Governor filed his own petition for certiorari (the "Governor's Petition"), seeking review of those portions of the opinion below which affirmed the grant of summary judgment dismissing his claims in connection with an editorial, editorial cartoon and political column. For reasons stated in the Globe's petition for certiorari, this Court ought to grant certiorari to review at least the issues raised by the Globe. The issues the Governor would have reviewed do not present substantial questions of federal law. Thus, while this Court should grant certiorari, the issues raised by the Governor need not be reached or may be summarily resolved. Sup. Ct. Rule 23.1.

Statement of the Case

A. *The November 22, 1981 Column*

The November 22, 1981 column, as was true of all of the challenged articles, dealt with the Governor's position and

[2] The cartoons and texts of the articles are appended to the SJC's decision and thus are included in Appendix A to the petition at pp. 19a-30a. They are collectively referred to herein as "articles."

actions in a public controversy. In late 1981, the Massachusetts legislature debated race track reform legislation. During the course of that debate, a dogtrack in Raynham, owned in part by one George Carney, sought additional racing dates. Exh. 7, Tab 22, Keelan Dep. 32-34.[3] A harness track in nearby Foxboro, owned in part by one Edward Keelan, opposed Raynham obtaining more dates in competition with Foxboro.[4] The bill enacted by the legislature gave Raynham additional dates.

The Governor and Keelan had had both a professional and personal relationship for a decade. Exh. 7, Tab 22, Keelan Dep. 22-25. K & S Building Associates, of which Keelan was a partner, owned a greyhound track in Plainfield, Connecticut. Exh. 7, Tab 10, Admissions Nos. 23, 27. In 1976, the Governor had assisted K & S in obtaining a construction loan, *id.* at Admission No. 30, and was paid a $50,000 finder's fee for his trouble. *Id.*, Admissions Nos. 36, 37. In 1976, the Governor's wife was a partner with Keelan and two other individuals

---

[3] The summary judgment briefs and appendices filed in the trial court were designated as Exhibits 1-8 by the plaintiff-appellant in the SJC. References thereto will be cited as "Exh. , Tab " along with any other information required to make the reference clearer.

[4] Keelan testified as follows:

Q. It was important to you all at Foxboro to keep that. . . non-competition portion of existing law in place, wasn't it?

A. Right.

Q. Sunday night racing was an important night for racing at Foxboro, isn't that fair to say?

A. That is right, yes. . . .

Q. It was important to Foxboro to be in effect the only game in town on Sunday nights, isn't that right?

A. That is correct.

Exh. 7, Tab 22, Keelan Dep. 34-35.

in Casey Stables, which owned four race horses. Tab 10, Admission Nos. 54 and 56. Keelan contributed $1,400 or $1,500 to the Governor's campaign. Exh. 7, Tab 22, Keelan Dep. 83, 87.

After Keelan's legislative lobbying failed — he admitted to being up on the hill "on a daily basis" in the final stages of the bill's travel, *id.* at 37-38 — the Governor acted. He returned the bill to the legislature with the message that he would approve it only with three amendments, one of which would prevent Sunday night competition between Foxboro and Raynham. The Governor wrote: "The Racing Commissioners have unanimously informed me that head-to-head Sunday night competition with Raynham/Taunton would force Foxboro out of business within twelve months." Exh. 7, Tab 14, King Aff. ¶ 3, Ex. 1.

About that time, Frank Rich, a former special advisor to the Governor, told columnist Farrell that Rich's son had run into Keelan at the State House one Saturday and that Keelan claimed to have been there on numerous Saturdays to see the Governor.[5] Exh. 7, Tab 26, Rich Dep. 20, 25. Farrell had

---

[5] Rich testified:

Q. Now, did you tell Mr. Farrell that you knew that Mr. Keelan came in regularly on Saturdays during that period to see the Governor?

A. I did.

Citations to the Joint Record Appendix filed in the SJC are cited as (R. .) (R. 685.)

Q. Now, when you learned from your son Christopher that he had seen Mr. Keelan in Governor King's office, you formed a conclusion in your own mind about what Mr. Keelan and Mr. King had been talking about. . . .

. . .

Q. And wasn't that conclusion that they had been discussing racing in a general sense?

A. I could see no other reason for Eddie Keelan to be in there.

. . .

been told by other officials, including the Senate President, that Keelan actively had been lobbying.[6] (R. 281-82).

On Sunday, November 22, 1981, the *Globe* published Farrell's column in the "Focus on Politics" section. It dealt with the Governor's relationship with an individual named Richard Thissen. In the column Farrell wrote that the Governor "manifests personal loyalty . . . toward associates. . . ." The next sentence is at issue: "Despite his close association with out-of-state dog racing promoter Eddie Keelan, King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxboro owned by Keelan and his partners."

B. *The "Billboard" Editorial and Cartoon*

On October 17, 1979, the *Globe* published an investigative story on the billboard industry. It reported, *inter alia*, that the administration was attempting to eliminate the Outdoor Advertising Board; that it was seeking "grandfather" status for billboards slated to be removed; and that the Governor had signed special legislation which allowed a sign at Brody Mountain ski resort to continue standing despite a court order to the contrary. Exh. 7, Tab 8. The article also reported that the bill-

---

[5] *cont.*

Q. And do you recall whether or not you discussed that conclusion, at least, with Mr. Farrell when you told him about the incident concerning your son's encounter with Mr. Keelan in Governor King's office?

A. I don't know if we used the words specifically; but I think it permeated the air.

Exh. 7, Tab 26, Rich 36; R. 694. Rich said repeatedly he equated Keelan's visits to the Governor with racing legislation. Exh. 7, Tab 26, Rich 46, 57, 61, 62.

[6] The Governor claims that Keelan could not have been at the State House on a Saturday because his name does not appear on the sign-in log. Christopher Rich, himself a King appointee, testified that he and other individuals often visited the State House without signing in. Exh. 8, Tab 8.

board company (Ackerley Communications) which stood to benefit the most from the grandfathering effort, was, "a company whose friends contributed $7,000 to Governor Edward J. King's gubernatorial campaign last fall." *Id.* Neither the Governor nor anyone else ever filed a lawsuit challenging anything reported in the investigative article.

The next day, October 18, 1979, the *Globe* ran an editorial and cartoon. The editorial said that "just before the September primary, seven of [Ackerley's] executives (and their friends and relatives) discovered Edward J. King, at the time just an underdog candidate for Governor, and dropped $7,000 into his campaign treasury." The editorial continued: "And back out of the Beacon Hill closet come all the old games. A bill zips through the Legislature and into law with King's signature to allow a ski resort billboard to remain despite a court order."[7]

The cartoon depicted the Governor and his Transportation Secretary, Barry Locke, on an Ackerley billboard, each holding a bag with a dollar sign on it. Szep's billboard carried the message, "Ackerley billboards can put money in your pockets too!"[8]

Reasons the Issues Raised by the Governor Need Not Be Reviewed by This Court

Common to the articles is that they criticize the Governor's performance as Governor. In its decision affirming summary judgment on the column, editorial and cartoon, the SJC found each non-actionable as an expression of opinion. The SJC

[7] The Governor testified that he did not sign the special legislation, but supported it and permitted it to become law without his signature. *See* Massachusetts Constitution, Part II, Ch. I, § 1, Art. II; *see generally Opinion of the Justices*, 99 Mass. 636 (1868).

[8] Locke, a King appointee, subsequently (in 1981) was indicted for theft and bribery, convicted and sentenced. Exh. 7, Tab 24, King Dep. III 138; Tab 9, Int. No. 10.

recognized that citizens may debate, question, and impugn motives of elected officials. App. 8a, 12a. The SJC was correct in holding these pieces protected. Furthermore, because many of the issues raised by the Governor are questions of state law, or lack broad importance, they do not warrant review in this Court.

I. Petitioner Presents No Substantial Federal Questions Requiring Review of the SJC's Decision on the November 22, 1981 Column.

A. *There Was No Waiver of the Protection for Opinion.*

The Governor argues that the columnist "waived" First Amendment considerations by testifying that the statement that King made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding was "factual." *See* Governor's Petition at 11-13.

First, no case, federal or state, is cited for the proposition that judicial inquiry of whether a statement is to be deemed protected "opinion" is foreclosed because a writer testifies that he meant the statement to be accurate or "factual." No reason is suggested why the determination of which speech will be protected is a personal right which casually may be waived. What we are dealing with is a judicial inquiry into what type of protection, if any, should attach to particular speech.[9]

[9] Judicial determination of the protected status of speech follows the Court's practice of identifying "as a matter of constitutional law" expressions of "rhetorical hyperbole" and the "'loose language or undefined slogans that are part of the conventional give-and-take in our economic and political controversies.'" *See Greenbelt Cooperative Publishing Association* v. *Bresler*, 398 U.S. 6, 13-14 (1970); *National Association of Letter Carriers* v. *Austin*, 418 U.S. 264, 284 (1974), *quoting Cafeteria Employees Local 302* v. *Angelos*, 320 U.S. 293, 295 (1943). No less than with the actual malice rule, the importance of the First Amendment protection for opinions mandates that "judges . . . make sure that [the rule] is correctly applied." *Bose Corp.* v. *Consumers Union of U.S., Inc.*, 466 U.S. 485, 502 (1984).

Second, the Governor has distorted the testimony of the columnist.[10] Farrell said that the statement was "fact and opinion." More importantly, read in context, Farrell simply was saying he believed what he wrote — hardly a "waiver" of constitutional protection.

Third, the issue is not waiver, as the Governor ultimately acknowledged. At most, Farrell's statement is some sort of admission: "An admission as to a libel defendant's state of mind or intent when writing an allegedly defamatory statement constitutes a binding admission." Governor's Petition at 12. The problem is that the effect to be given an admission in state court is a matter governed by the state's law of evidence. The Governor recognizes as much by citing a treatise on the Massachusetts law of evidence as the only support for his argument.[11] *Id.*

---

[10] Farrell testified:

A. "King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding on the legislation that would greatly benefit the harness track at Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners."

King has made no secret of his efforts to do Keelan's bidding, that's a fact.

Q. Then the words, "on the legislation"?

A. Well, yes, include that, too, "on the legislation."

Q. And "that would greatly benefit the harness track?"

A. "At Foxborough owned by Keelan and his partners?"

Q. That's a fact, too, isn't it?

A. *That's a fact and opinion.*

Q. Now, you say at the time you wrote it and at the time it was published, you believed the facts were true, right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you didn't have any doubt about them, is that right?

A. Yes.

R. 323-24. (Emphasis added.)

[11] Although the Governor presented his waiver argument both to the trial court and SJC, neither thought the argument worthy of discussion.

B. *The SJC's Interpretation of the Article at Issue Does Not Raise Any Issue Requiring Review by This Court.*

The Governor also strains to find an accusation of bribery in the criticism that he did an associate's "bidding." The Governor finds constitutional significance in whether the statement implies the existence of "undisclosed defamatory false 'facts'." Governor's Petition at 13.

First, the SJC surely was right when it concluded the article "makes no implication of corruption." App. 12a. The columnist cites personal *loyalty*, not venality, as the basis for the Governor's actions. Only the most tortured reading of the statement can produce the meaning of which the Governor complains.

Second, the dispute over how to interpret this column hardly rises to constitutional significance. Massachusetts follows standards laid down in such cases as *Smith* v. *Suburban Restaurants, Inc.*, 374 Mass. 528, 373 N.E.2d 215 (1978) and *Sharratt* v. *Housing Innovations, Inc.*, 365 Mass. 141, 310 N.E.2d 343 (1974). The SJC's refusal to twist the statement in the fashion suggested by the plaintiff is consistent with its long-settled rule that it will not "plac[e] a strained and unnatural construction on [a] writing to impute [a defamatory] meaning to it." *Tobin* v. *Boston Herald-Traveler Corp.*, 324 Mass. 478, 488, 87 N.E.2d 116, 121 (1949). The plaintiff cannot seriously contend that this Court need review the application of those well-established principles of state law to the facts of this case.

Even if interpretation of the challenged statement turned on federal law, a narrow question of how legal doctrine applies to particular facts would not warrant certiorari. *See, e.g., NLRB* v. *Hendricks County Rural Electric Corp.*, 454 U.S. 170, 177 n.8 (1981) (cross petition for certiorari presenting a question of fact "does not merit Court review.") Consideration of hidden meanings in the charge that a Governor does the "bidding" of an

associate is unlikely to supply useful guidance to the lower courts in future cases. Questions as fact-specific as the meaning of particular words lack the wide-ranging impact or general relevance to justify resolution in this Court. *See Rudolph* v. *United States*, 370 U.S. 269, 270 (1962) (certiorari dismissed as improvidently granted where case turned on application of settled law to facts, "and their review would be of no importance save to litigants themselves"). The writ thus need not issue on this ground.

II. The SJC's Decision on the Billboard Editorial and Cartoon Does Not Raise an Issue Worthy of Certiorari.

The Governor also seeks review of whether the SJC erred in finding the editorial and cartoon commenting on his billboard policies to be protected opinion. The Governor's issue concerns an application of Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 (1977), which at least one Circuit Court of Appeals treats as a matter of state law. *See Avins* v. *White*, 627 F.2d 637, 642 (3d Cir. 1980).[12] The doctrine distinguishes between statements of protected "pure" opinion and potentially actionable "mixed" opinion: the factual basis of "pure" opinion is disclosed or assumed, while "mixed" opinions lack an apparent factual basis and might lead readers to infer false, defamatory facts. *See* Restatement (Second) of Torts § 566 comment b (1977). *See also Pritsker* v. *Brudnoy*, 389 Mass. 776, 778-79, 452 N.E.2d 227, 228-29 (1983). The Governor appears to contend that the SJC erred in holding the cartoon and editorial protected "pure"

---

[12] *See also Flotech, Inc.* v. *E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 814 F.2d 775, 777 n.2 (1st Cir. 1987) (analyzing question of opinion by reference to state law, where "Massachusetts law is at least as protective as federal law on this issue. . . .")

opinion because "assumed" facts were supplied in a news article the day before. *See* App. 9a.

Notwithstanding the Governor's efforts to find actionable "facts" in an editorial and cartoon, the SJC correctly concluded that a newspaper can comment on events reported the day before. The editorial pointed readers to a readily available news story to obtain factual background. *See* App. 22a. *Cf. Aldoupolis* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 398 Mass. 731, 735, 500 N.E.2d 794, 797 (1986). Readers had no occasion to infer other, undisclosed facts in support of the opinion expressed. Under the principles of § 566, no liability attaches to opinions based on disclosed or assumed facts because it is unreasonable to infer defamatory facts when the factual basis of an opinion is otherwise available. *See, e.g., Pritsker*, 389 Mass. at 781, n.7, 452 N.E.2d at 230, n.7. It is significant that neither the Governor, nor anyone else, has ever sued over the news coverage cited in support of the Globe's editorial opinion.[13]

The SJC's decision was consistent with the decisions of other lower courts in refusing to read a political cartoon literally to embrace an accusation of bribery. In *Keller* v. *Miami Herald Publishing Co.*, 778 F.2d 711 (11th Cir. 1985), the Eleventh Circuit held that a similar cartoon, depicting plaintiff with

---

[13] The SJC's holding and rationale are fully consistent with settled principles of Massachusetts law, and decisions of the Circuit Courts of Appeals. In *Myers* v. *Boston Magazine Co., Inc.*, 380 Mass. 336, 341, 403 N.E.2d 376, 379 (1980), the SJC held that a newscaster's regular TV appearances formed the assumed factual basis for a satiric comment about his journalistic ability. In *Pritsker*, the SJC rejected petitioner's very argument, that protection for "pure" opinion requires that the public actually have seen the "assumed" facts relied upon by the commentator. 389 Mass. at 781, n.7, 452 N.E.2d at 230, n.7. The decision below simply follows the SJC's holding in *Pritsker*, that opinions may be formed as to any matter "open to the public". 387 Mass. at 781, 452 N.E.2d at 230. *See also Janklow* v. *Newsweek, Inc.*, 788 F.2d 1300 (8th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 107 S. Ct. 272 (1986) (public activities of Attorney General formed basis of protected opinion); *Ollman* v. *Evans*, 750 F.2d 970 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 471 U.S. 1127 (1985) (political activities and writings of professor appropriate for comment).

money bags, was a figurative expression of the cartoonist's views on a public controversy, *not* an actionable assertion of fact.[14] The lower courts are unanimous, as far as respondents know, in holding that political cartoons are non-actionable for libel.[15] Likewise, editorials are consistently viewed as the classic vehicles for a newspaper's opinions. *See, e.g., Ollman*, 750 F.2d at 986; *Aldoupolis*, 398 Mass. at 734, 500 N.E.2d at 797. The SJC neither created conflict nor strayed from the teachings of this Court in finding the cartoon and editorial protected. Supreme Court review is unnecessary because there is no conflict among lower courts to resolve.

---

[14] Precisely because cartoons are *not* read as statements of literal fact, no conflict exists with the Second Circuit's decision in *Cianci* v. *New Times Publishing Co.*, 639 F.2d 54 (2d Cir. 1980), which involved an outright accusation of rape.

[15] In every case of which defendants are aware, lower courts have held editorial cartoons to be nonlibellous. *E.g., Loeb* v. *Globe Newspaper Co.*, 489 F. Supp. 481 (D. Mass. 1980) (Cuckoo springing from head of plaintiff); *Wecht* v. *PG Publishing Co.*, 510 A.2d 769 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1986) (public official depicted as strange creature possessing undesirable traits, spouting obscenities while in voting booth); *Miskovsky* v. *Tulsa Tribune Co.*, 678 P.2d 242 (Okla. 1983), *cert. denied*, 465 U.S. 1006 (1984) (Plaintiff sucking on sewer pipe; claimed allegation of sodomy); *Yorty* v. *Chandler*, 13 Cal. App. 3d 467, 91 Cal. Rptr. 709 (1970) (strait-jacketed mayor surrounded by orderlies, captioned "I've got to go now . . . I've been appointed Secretary of Defense and the Secret Service men are here!").

Conclusion

Certiorari should issue to review the questions presented in the Petition for Certiorari of the Globe and Farrell. Review is unnecessary, or a summary affirmance warranted,[16] as to the issues raised by the Governor.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH L. KOCIUBES,*
ROBIN A. DRISKEL,
DON E. GORTON, III,
BINGHAM, DANA & GOULD,
100 Federal Street,
Boston, Massachusetts 02110.
(617) 348-8000

*Counsel of Record

[16] Summary affirmance, Sup. Ct. Rule 23.1, is appropriate where the lower court's disposition on the merits was obviously correct. *See, e.g., United States* v. *Lane Motor Co.*, 344 U.S. 630 (1953).